

# THE CLASSICAL QUARTERLY

APRIL 1909.

## ARGOS IN HOMER.

THIS paper is an attempt to elucidate the senses in which this place-name is used in Homer; to assign meanings to the Homeric terms Achæan, Iæson and Pelasgic Arge, to 'Argive' as a synonym for Greek, and to establish the nature of the Argos over which Agamemnon ruled. I take the Homeric poems as the unity which they profess to be, and which they must be for historical enquiry. Whatever liberties Homer took with his materials (and I credit him with as free a hand as any one has allowed to Pisistratus) it is plain he was careful to respect events. The effort to distinguish between old and new in the Iliad and Odyssey has caused needless and fruitless encumbrance to the official historians, such as Busolt; the unitarian position has given us the remarkable results of Professor Myres' paper on the Pelasgians, *J.H.S.* 1907, 170 sqq.). The consistency of Mr. Myres' account, and I venture to hope of mine, allows a fresh inference back to the homogeneity of the poems which are their source.

### I.

It may be useful in the first place to collect the views of the meaning of ἄργος current in later Greece. Strabo 372, after an enumeration of the various cases of Argos, says ἄργος δὲ καὶ τὸ πεδῖον λέγεται παρὰ τοῖς νεωτέροις, παρ' Ὀμήρῳ δ' οἷδ' ἀπαξ· μάλιστα δ' οἰοῦνται Μακεδονικὸν καὶ Θετταλικὸν εἶναι. The latter remark seems an inference from the Δάτιον and Ὀρεστικὸν ἄργος where there were no towns, and therefore the word must mean a district. It is true that no case of ἄργος as a common noun is found in Homer (unless indeed it is necessary so to take δ 174 sqq., see p. 94), but that the various proper names Ἀργος take their origin from the common noun there is no reason to doubt; every Argos in historical use in Greece is either a valley or a town in one: and there are many parallels, e.g. in Greece Ἐλος, Ἥλις;





Πηνεϊὺ καὶ τῶν Θερμοπυλῶν ἕως τῆς ὀρεινῆς τῆς κατὰ Πινόον, διὰ τὸ ἐπάρχαι τῶν τόπων τούτων τοὺς Πελασγούς [this clearly is from Ephorus]; 431 τὸ τε Ἄργος τὸ Πελασγικὸν οἱ μὲν καὶ πόλιν δέχονται Θετταλικὴν περὶ Λάρισσαν ἰδρυμένην ποτὲ νῦν δ' οὐκέτι οὔσαν· οἱ δ' οὐ πόλιν ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν Θετταλῶν πεδίων οὕτως ὀνοματικῶς λεγόμενον, θεμένου τοῦνομα Ἄβαντος ἐξ Ἄργους δεῦρ' ἀποικίσαντος. 371 οἶμαι δ' ὅτι καὶ Πελασγιώτας καὶ Δαναούς, ὥσπερ καὶ Ἀργεῖους, ἡ δόξα τῆς πόλεως ταύτης ἀπ' αὐτῆς καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις Ἕλληνας καλεῖσθαι παρεσκεύασεν· οὕτω δὲ καὶ Ἰασίδας καὶ Ἰασον Ἄργος. We see Strabo, according to his honest wont, endeavouring to support the doctrine he has received by the usage of Homer, and making that usage as consistent as may be). The doctrine itself must have been much older; the statement in Apollodorus ii. 3 seems to come from Acusilaus and besides that in Strabo 221 the argument for making Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος a name of Thessaly is taken from Ephorus, who is quoted in the immediate neighbourhood, the name 'Pelasgic' without the word 'argos' in this sense is common among the 5th century logographers: Hellanicus *fr.* 28 has the four divisions of Thessaly, of which Πελασγιώτις is one (Herodotus i. 56 mentions Ἰστιαιώτις); Hecataeus *fr.* 334 calls Thessaly Πελασγία; Pherecydes *fr.* 26 says Acrisius retreated εἰς τοὺς Πελασγούς εἰς Λάρισσαν, or according to a v.l., εἰς Λάρισσαν τὴν Πελασγικὴν. Acusilaus *fr.* 11 states that Peloponnesus as far as Pharsalia (μέχρι Φαρσαλίας Tzetzes) and Larissa Πελασγία ἐκλήθη.

The interpretations thus placed upon heroic and prae-heroic names are no doubt very ancient; there is nothing to prevent them hailing from early post-Homeric epos. They represent as a whole the efforts of the Dorian peoples to fit themselves into the heroic age. Strabo 431 has given us the detailed claim on which the Pharsalians (unknown to Homer) relied for the possession of Phthia and Hellas (a claim admitted by the Peripatetic antiquarian Dicaearchus, *Geog. min.* p. 109); the Heraclid Argives of Argolis took Agamemnon to their king,<sup>1</sup> with such success that the potentate of Sicily forbade the recitation of Homer on the ground that the poet exalted his neighbour Argos;<sup>2</sup> the Megarians, like the Pharsalians, non-existent in Homer, attacked, but in vain, the *Catalogue*. The Ἰωνικὸς ποιητὰς repelled them, and their ill-success suggests that the Sons of Homer in early days could do something to defend their father. They found less resistance in Hesiod; the land poet was more amenable than the Chian, and they are duly seated, equipped with their heroic epithet, among Ajax' possessions in *Pap. Berl.* 10568 v. 5 καὶ Μέγαρα σκιόντα καὶ ὀφρύνοντα Κόρινθον.

The editors (*Berliner Klassikertexte* v. i. 1907) have hardly appreciated the significance of this portion of Hesiod. When the poet says

Ἄλγας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμείνος ἀμώμητος πολέμιστῆς  
μνήτω· δίδου δ' ἄρα ἔδνα εὐκότα, θαυματὰ ἔργα·

And put three of the Pelopidae into the line of Inachus, e.g. in Tatian's genealogy, *adv. Graecos* c. 39.

<sup>2</sup> There is no need to assume with Wilamowitz

*Hom. Unt.* 352 that Clisthenes was jealous of the Θηβαίς, where there was no King of Men and the rôle of Argos was not over-glorious.

οἱ γὰρ ἔχον Τροίηνα καὶ ἀγχίαλον Ἐπίδανρον  
 νῆσόν τ' Ἀγγειναν Μάσητά τε κούροι Ἀχαιῶν,  
 καὶ Μέγαρα σκιδόντα καὶ ὄφρυνόντα Κόρινθον,  
 Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίην τε παρέξ ἅλα ναιετάσας,  
 τῶν ἔφατ' εἰλίποδός τε βόας καὶ ἴφια μῆλα  
 συνελίσσας δώσειν, ἐκέαστο γὰρ ἔγχεϊ μακρῷ—

he has given the Megarians what they in vain sought from Homer, an heroic existence under the banner of Ajax. To glorify Ajax's state the complaisant Hesiodic enriched him at the expense of his compeers; Troezen, Epidaurus, Aegina, Mases, Hermione and Asine are taken from the kingdom of Argolis; Corinth is filched from the King of Men. At what period in Megarian history claims of this magnitude were made concerns the professionals; in any case it happened before Pisistratus' day. But these variants, where the general motive is so plain, the Berlin editors say 'sind schwerlich beabsichtigte Aenderungen, sondern unserer Ueberlieferung gleichwertig.' It was simple to expect (p. 38) 'in den hesiodischen Katalogen die echte Fassung des homerischen benutzt zu finden.' Rather we now see the origin of the variant νῆσόν τ' Ἀγγειναν which Strabo notes 'some' wished to get into B 562, of the version of the whole passage in the *Certamen* 278, and of part of the oracle *infra*. On the other hand the editors need not postdate their fragment—which they bring down later than Pisistratus. Surely even the Hesiodic well had dried by the end of the sixth century; and what had become of the ambitions of Megara? The legend that the Homeric Catalogue 'assumed its present form' under Pisistratus, or generally that Homer suffered editing at the hands of Pisistratus or the Athenians, dies hard. Mr. Verrall has breathed some life into it in a genial article in the July number of the *Quarterly Review* for 1908, and captive made of Mr. Murray (*Anthropology and the Classics*, p. 68). The arguments for the substantial canonicity of the Iliad and Odyssey as early as about 800 B.C. are briefly these: (1) the existence of the Cycle, which presupposes the Iliad and the Odyssey, of the compass in which we have them, two centuries before Pisistratus. The dates of the Cycle are unimpugned, and rest on evidence which compared to Mr. Verrall's 'record' of the Athenian Reformation is scientific. (2) The appeals made to the *Catalogue* as a title in international matters, first in Pisistratus' own century. Athenians could not have produced a document which they had altered in their own interest. We may add that the intelligence of the sixth century was not so low as to overlook and forgive a forgery. We have the case of Onomacritus. (3) The insignificant part given to Athens in the poems. There are signs indeed of a more local Athenian version, but it did not affect the vulgate. No nation guilty of 'editing' could have produced so poor a result. (4) The ex parte origin of the whole story, Megara (I need not give the references).<sup>1</sup> As Megara ascribed its non-existence in Homer to the machinations of its enemy, so the Sicyonians,

<sup>1</sup> See C.A. 1907, 18.

eager like the  
 Δοῖοῖσσι the  
 by Pisistratus  
 As Athenian  
 (Paus. vii. 26)  
 Athenians for  
 poet, that an  
 and Mr. Ver  
 and of exte  
 curricular re  
 the New M  
 the Persians  
 orator Lycin  
 Athenians s  
 should be re  
 a better per  
 more produ  
 by Dr. E. K  
 worked ther

The mo  
 two<sup>2</sup>: (1)  
 authority of  
 in Ὑμεῖς on  
 and Ion (ib

5

Dinias the  
 asserted the  
 it seems to  
 mitted thei  
 heroic age.

<sup>1</sup> The Megari  
 fact; the later  
 been in the he  
 Elean coast w  
 prejudice the  
 island and his  
 ally, unimport  
 archipelago and  
 at twelve ships,

eager like their king to protest against the predominance of Argos, said Δονόεσσα the coast-town (outside historical Sicyonian territory) had been altered by Pisistratus to Γονόεσσα, a village near the Argive border (ὑπὲρ Σικυώνος Paus.). As Athenian interests were not concerned, the mistake was made ἵπ' ἀγνοίας (Paus. vii. 26); the Megarians had imputed mala fides.<sup>1</sup> This reward had the Athenians for the religious scruple with which they treated the international poet, that antiquity accused them of tampering with the title of their neighbours, and Mr. Verrall has detected a great scheme of harmonisation within the poems, and of external adaptation and combination of them into a cycle, to suit the curricular regeneration of the Athenian race. The Privatdozent won at Sedan, the New Model at Naseby, and the Wooden Horse in his due place repelled the Persians. The readers of the *Quarterly* should know that the way the orator Lycurgus, our only authority, puts this great movement is that 'the Athenians so esteemed this poet that they ordered his works and his only should be recited every five years at the Panathenaea.' Mr. Verrall would find a better period for his constructions in the age of the great rhapsodes, and a more productive hero in Lycurgus, whose existence has been recently vindicated by Dr. E. Reich. The sutures in the Iliad are there, but no Athenian needle worked them.

The mentions of the term Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος in independent literature are two<sup>2</sup>: (1) the oracle (Hendess 178) given in Schol. Theocr. xiv. 48 on the authority of Dinias (ἐν Ἀργολικοῖς, *F.H.G.* iii. 25) and by Photius and Suidas in Ὑμῆϊς on that of Mnaseas of Patara (Δελφικῶν χρησμῶν συναγωγή *F.H.G.* iii. 149) and Ion (*ib.* ii. 51). Variants apart it runs

Γαῖης μὲν πάσης τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἄμεινον,  
ἄνδρες δ' οἱ πίνουσιν ὕδωρ καλῆς Ἀρεθούσης.  
ἀλλ' ἔτι καὶ τῶν εἰσὶν ἀμείνονες οἱ τὸ μεσηγνὺ  
Τίρυνθος ναῖουσι καὶ Ἀρκαδῆς πολυμήλου,

5 Ἀργεῖοι λιθοθήρηκες κέντρα πολέμοιο.  
ὑμεῖς δ' ὦ Μεγαρεῖς οὔτε τρίτοι οὔτε τέταρτοι,  
οὔτε δωδέκατοι, οὔτ' ἐν λόγῳ οὔτ' ἐν ἀριθμῷ.

Dinias the Argive antiquarian read Μεγαρεῖς in v. 6, whereas Ion and Mnaseas asserted the oracle was given to the inhabitants of Aegium. In Dinias' version it seems to chronicle a case of the same ambition of the Megarians which permitted their antiquarians, Hereas and Dieuchidas, their efforts to get into the heroic age. The oracle is late and its sources rather Hesiodic than Homeric;

<sup>1</sup> The Megarian claim may have had some basis in fact; the later Megara, nameless in Homer, may have been in the heroic age the *μεγαλα* of Salamis, as the Elean coast was of Ithaca. This however does not prejudice the entry in the *Catalogue*: Ajax with his island and his unnamed *μεγαλα* was important personally, unimportant politically, like Odysseus with his archipelago and his peraea. Both heroes were rated at twelve ships, the Athenians sent fifty; they were a

maritime power. The moderns wish to see Megara in Νῆρα (B 508): this had not occurred to Hereas and Dieuchidas, and whatever effect the hexameter may have had in spacing places in the *Catalogue*, Antheion is a very long way from Megara.

<sup>2</sup> My excuse for this detail is that none of the following passages are given in Smith or in Pauly-Wissowa.

the Pelasgic Argos no doubt is given its antiquarian sense. Still the argos as a proverb for fertility may have started in Malis; the Echinaei according to Polybius ix. 41. 11 καρπούνται γῆν πάμφορον. Zenodotus' reading B 681 is in the same sense. (2) Suidas in v. Ἀργόλαι tells this story: εἶδος ὄφειον, οὗς ἤνεγκε Μακεδὼν Ἀλέξανδρος ἐκ τοῦ Ἀργου τοῦ Πελασγικοῦ εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν, καὶ ἐνέβαλεν εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν πρὸς ἀναίρεσιν τῶν ἀσπίδων, ὅτε μετέθηκε τὰ ὀστά Ἱερεμίου τοῦ προφήτου ἐξ Αἰγύπτου εἰς Ἀλεξάνδρειαν οὗς ὁ αὐτὸς προφήτης ἀπέκτεινε. Ἀργόλαι οὖν, ἐκ τοῦ Ἀργου λαοί. The source of this history is obscure; in another version it is found in the *Chronicon Paschale* c. 156 (Migne, *Patrol.* 92 p. 383) where instead of Πελασγικοῦ we find Πελοποννησιακοῦ. Moschus, *Pratum Spirituale* c. 77 (Migne, vol. 87 pt. 3) has a story of the translation of Jeremy's bones by Alexander, but nothing about serpents or Ἀργος. (I owe these two references to the kindness of the Rev. F. E. Brightman.) The work quoted in the notes to Suidas (*Hierozoicon, sive bipertitum opus de animalibus sacrae scripturae auctore Samuele Bocharto*, Londini 1663 p. 449) sends me to Aristotle, *περὶ θημασίων ἀκουσμάτων*, who has an Argive locust, (ἐν Ἀργεὶ ἀκρίδας) which fights scorpions, and an ἱερὸς ὄφεις in Thessaly which is death to mankind and reptiles alike (844 b 139, 845 b 151). Argos and Thessaly seem to correspond to the Peloponnesian and Pelasgic Argos of the ecclesiastical writers. Or, what is as likely and as immaterial, Suidas' source may have followed Euripides, who *Orestes* 1276 has Πελασγὸν Ἀργος simply in the sense of Argolis.

There is therefore no evidence that the term Πελασγικὸν Ἀργος was a real place-name in historical Greece. It was used by the learned in the sense which tradition gave to Homer's expression B 681.

About the etymology nothing is known. The connection with 'white' disproves itself. Plains near the sea usually and waterlogged valleys always are green.

## II.

When we turn from posthomeric doctrine to the usage of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* it will be convenient to deal with the specific cases first and Argos in general afterwards. The specific cases are Ἀχαικόν, Ἴασον and Πελασγικόν. The Achaean again comes naturally with Agamemnon's Argos.

Ἴασον Ἀργος is mentioned once; σ 245 Eurymachus pays Penelope a compliment;

κούρη Ἰκαρίοιο περίφρον Πηνελοπείη,  
εἰ πάντες σε ἴδοιεν ἂν' Ἴασον Ἀργος Ἀχαιοί,  
πλέονες κε μνηστήρες ἐν ὑμετέροισι δόμοισι  
ἥωθεν δαίνεσθαι, ἐπεὶ περίσσι γυναῖκων.

'We, poor islanders, who have the advantage of knowing you by sight, have sent the contingent of suitors which you see. If the Achaeans in Iason Argos caught sight of you, what a crowd there would be tomorrow!' The ancients

connected  
Forsch. i. p.  
of quantity  
that Krets  
the Ionian

I open  
Homeric p  
to οἱ μὲν  
is singular  
Still even  
'Ιλιάδος ὡ  
τοιανύτης π  
ἀπρήτησε  
εἰθ' ἐξῆς π  
τὸ τρίτον  
conceive  
applied to  
in Nicola  
Orchomen  
with the  
Locrians  
Orchome  
of μέν su  
insist on  
women,  
I must c  
to be a  
have ex  
several p

Pers  
Athenian  
lover of  
have 'I  
Laconia,  
ante-Gre  
as we s  
τοὺς ἐξ  
fr. 37 (C  
'Ιασος κ  
τὴν βασ  
'Ιασος δ

<sup>1</sup>On the

connected *ἴασον* with *ἰάονες*, and so for the most part the moderns (E. Meyer *Forsch.* i. p. 94 and elsewhere, Busolt ed. 2 i. 283 n. 3), but the double difference of quantity, *ἴασον ἰάονες* and the presence of sigma are against it. I notice that Kretschmer *Glotta* i. 13, 14 does not reckon *ἴασον* among the cognates of the Ionian name.

I open a parenthesis to remark that it cannot be denied that in the one Homeric passage where this name occurs, N 685 sqq., *Ἰάονες* in 585 corresponds to οἱ μὲν Ἀθηναίων προλεγεμένοι 689, although the double name for one people is singular at such a short distance, and the construction of μὲν 689 is strange. Still even by Galen's quaint system of counting xviii. 2. 676 ἐν δὲ τῷ ὅτῃ τῆς Ἰλιάδος ὥσπερ ἐξεπύτηδες ἐνδείξασθαι βουλόμενος ὡς οὐ χρὴ πεφροντικέαι τῆς τοιαύτης τάξεως, πάντα καταλέξω ἐφεξῆς πράγματα πρὸς μὲν τὸ δεύτερον (Iaones) ἀπύνητσε πρῶτον (Athenians), εἰθ' ἐξῆς πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον (Boeotians, sc. Phidas etc.), εἰθ' ἐξῆς πρὸς τὸ πέμπτον (Epeans), εἴτα πρὸς τὸ τέταρτον (Phthians), εἴτα πρὸς τὸ τρίτον (Locrians, sc. Ajax)—every nation is accounted for, and by a process of exhaustion Iaones and Athenians are the same. It is difficult however to conceive the circumstances under which in the heroic age the Ionian name applied to Athens only; overt evidence that it did not is given by the story in Nicolaus of Damascus (c. 53) of the war between the Ionians and the Orchomenians. Athenians could have made no direct war on Orchomenus, with the Homeric Boeotians between. The term must have applied to the Locrians of Opus and Larymna, and the war have been between them and Orchomenus. In Hecataeus *fr.* 343 Ion is a Locrian.<sup>1</sup> Therefore, as the position of μὲν suggests, there must have been an omission in the passage. I do not insist on Nicolaus' further detail that the children of the captive Orchomenian women, expelled by their Ionian fathers, εἰς Θορικὸν τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀπεχώρησαν. I must delay a moment to notice that any passage is more likely than this to be an 'Athenian interpolation' (Leaf). An Athenian interpolation would have exhibited Athens as the mother of historical Ionia, not as one among several petty tribes in a small area. I return to the *ἴασον Ἀργος*.

Person-names similar to *ἴασον* are common; in Homer there is *Ἰάσος* an Athenian O 332, 337, *Ἰασίδης* an Orchomenian λ 283, a Cyprian ρ 443, *Ἰασίων* lover of Demeter ε 125. I need not go further afield. As a place-name we have *Ἰασος* or *Ἰασσος* in Caria, *ἴασον* a πόλιςμα on the north border of Laconia, Paus. vii. 13. 7. The word therefore seems a real one and probably ante-Greek. As to its topographical meaning in this passage, the usual belief, as we see in Strabo 369 cited above, was that it meant Peloponnesus (οὐ γὰρ τοὺς ἐξ ὅλης τῆς Ἑλλάδος εἰκός, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐγγύς). One logographer, Hellanicus *fr.* 37 (=schol. Γ 75), gave a more precise definition, however he arrived at it; *Ἰάσος καὶ Πελασγὸς Τριόπα παῖδες* τελευτήσαντος δὲ αὐτοῖς τοῦ πατρὸς διείλοντο τὴν βασιλείαν. λαχὼν δὲ Πελασγὸς μὲν τὰ πρὸς Ἑρασίνοιο ποταμὸν ἔκτισε Λάρισαν, Ἰάσος δὲ τὰ πρὸς Ἕλιν (Ἰλιον MS.). The realm of Iasus was the Elis side of

<sup>1</sup> On these peoples there is abundant information in Δοκικά by W. A. Oldfather, *Philologus*, 1908.

Peloponnesus; and this is demanded by the passage in the Odyssey. When Professor E. Meyer says (*Forsch.* l.c.) the Ithacans had nothing to do with the Peloponnese, he hardly realises the conditions. To the inhabitants of the archipelago which with Corfu added we call the Ionian islands, 'land,' *ἡπειρος*, meant the west coast of Peloponnese. The continent opposite them was in the hands of Taphians and Teleboans (the latter a land-people, if Amphitryon Hes. *Scut.* 19 conducted a land-war against them); their social and commercial dealings were with the long flat coast which south of Araxus is only broken by Chelonatas and Ichthys; here they possessed land (B 635 οἱ τ' ἡπειρον ἔχον ἢ ἀντιπέραν ἐνέμοντο).<sup>1</sup> Noemon δ 635 wishes to cross "Ἠλιδ' ἐς εὐρύχωρον, where he keeps his twelve mares and his unbroken mules; the writer of the Telegonia, an even more local poem than the Odyssey, tells how after the burial of the suitors Ulysses εἰς Ἥλιν ἀποπλεῖ ἐπισκεψόμενος τὰ βουκόλια; the legend of Pheneus (Paus. viii. 14) made him keep his horses as far off as that.<sup>2</sup> The linguistic evidence is held to shew that the islanders were a colony from Triphylia (Hoffmann ap. Collitz *Dial. Inschr.* ii. 166); according to Aristarchus reported by Epaphroditus ap. Steph. Byz. in Δουλίχιον the Dulichians were called Ἐπειοί, and cf. Strabo 456; in their isolation the νησιῶται regarded their mother-land as the world. These circumstances fall in with Hellanicus' partition. The Iason argos was the plain of Hollow Elis and Triphylia. On this coast also we find the curious names Σαμικόν, Φειά, Χάα, Ἰάρανος, which point anywhere but to the Greek tongue. Ἰάσον with its Carian cousin may go with them.<sup>3</sup>

Ἄργος πελασγικόν in Homer is the valley of the Spercheus and the Maliaic Gulf as far as Echinus and Alope on the north and (probably) Pylae on the south (*C.R.* 1906, 193 sq.). Mr. Myres remarks (*J.H.S.* 1907, 179 n. 16) that analogy suggests that a specific *town* is intended. Not necessarily; the section on Sparta B 581-590 is introduced by the district, κοίλην Λακεδαίμονα κητώεσσαν, after which follow the towns Pharis, Sparta, Messe, Bryseae, Augeae, Amyclae, Helos, Laas and Oetylus. I find it difficult also to believe that Πελασγικόν is a descriptive epithet 'suggested by . . . remains of early or at all events prae-Achaean fortifications.' In the cases where the adj. in -κός is given to places it is locative: Ἀμφιλοχικόν, Ἀχαικόν Ὀρεστικόν. Further, Λάρισσα Πελασγία only a little beyond Echinus is suggestive. The domain of Peleus also included the vague aboriginal districts Phthia and Hellas, and of the three names of their inhabitants one was Ἀχαιοί. Hellas moved in later days, Achaeans and Phthia crystallised into the district known as Achaia Phthiotis. The valley of the Spercheus lost its importance in the Dorian system, and became a halt between

<sup>1</sup> Here I am happy to find myself in agreement with Mr. Leaf, against Strabo 461.

<sup>2</sup> This among other reasons tells against believing the heroic Ithaca to have been the historical Leucas, whatever may have been the name of the Mycenaean community in the latter. If Ithaca had been Leucas, a large peninsula with valleys and abundant soil, it

would either have had no peraea, or if it had, that peraea must have been the mainland from which it was only separated by its lagoon.

<sup>3</sup> *Fick, Vorgrichische Ortsnamen*, 1905, p. 121, while suggesting the connection with Ἰάσον thinks of Argolis, which whatever ἴασον may mean is inconceivable.

two passes;  
and its name  
have said be  
river-valley,  
and of the l

Before  
the Homeri  
of Mycenae  
Pellene, Ae  
Gonoessa, a  
Orneae, Go  
lower cours  
the only or  
Argolis. T  
and Asine i  
under Dion  
Mecisteus.  
less Mycen  
was therefo  
entirely on  
dodecapoli  
told of any  
that the  
peraea) an  
no foothol  
overland c  
These  
whole of t  
comme de

Agamem

<sup>1</sup> On the t  
Mith. xxxi  
of a Κρόσιον

two passes; its glory went to the nobles of Pharsalus (nonexistent in Homer), and its name was attracted to the *τετραρχία* Pelasgiotis. I will repeat what I have said before, that for Homer Achilles is a local chieftain, owning a long river-valley, limited at its mouth by the kingdoms of Protesilaus to the north and of the lesser Ajax to the south, and an undefined hinterland.<sup>1</sup>

### III.

Before we discuss *Ἄργος Ἀχαικόν* and *Ἄργος* alone, it is desirable to notice the Homeric account of Agamemnon's own kingdom. It consists B 569 sqq. of Mycenae, Corinth, Cleonae, Orneae, Araethyrea, Sicyon, Hyperesia, Gonoessa, Pellene, Aegium, 'all the Aegialus,' Helice. Of these places Cleonae, Orneae, Gonoessa, and Araethyrea are mountain-villages, Cleonae on the road to Corinth, Orneae, Gonoessa, and Araethyrea at the head of the Asopus valley, on the lower course of which Phlius (not in Homer) and Sicyon stand, but Mycenae is the only one on the southern side, and the only one in the valley later called Argolis. This valley containing the towns of Argos, Tiryns, and also Hermione and Asine in a deep gulf,<sup>2</sup> Troezen, Eionae, Epidaurus, Aegina and Mases, were under Diomedes the stranger, Sthenelus son of Capaneus, and Euryalus son of Mecisteus. The Argolid kingdom proper consisted of the valley of the Inachus, less Mycenae, and the whole of the Hermionic and Epidaurian peninsula. It was therefore largely maritime. Agamemnon's seaboard on the other hand lay entirely on the gulf of Corinth, as far as the Epean border, and included the dodecapolis, mother of historical Ionia, itself in history Achaea. We are not told of anything corresponding to the later Cenchræae, and it is to be presumed that the *Catalogue* views the Saronic Gulf generally up to Salamis (and its peraea) and Athens as the property of the Argolid monarchy. Agamemnon had no foothold on the Argolic Gulf, and therefore his access to Mycenae was overland only.

These conditions are not merely stated in the *Catalogue*, they hold for the whole of the two poems. When Diomedes returns from Troy he lands 'in Argos,' *comme de juste*.

γ 180 τέτρατον ἦμαρ ἔην ὅτ' ἐν Ἀργεὶ νῆας εἶσας  
Τυδείδω ἔταροι Διομήδεος ἰπποδάμιοι  
ἔστασαν.

Agamemnon's *νόστος* was quite different:

δ 512 σὸς δὲ που ἔκφυγε κῆρας ἀδελφεὸς ἦδ' ὑπάλυξεν  
ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῇσι· σάωσε δὲ πτόνια Ἥρη.  
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ τάχ' ἐμελλε Μαλειῶν ὄρος αἰπύ  
ῖξέσθαι, τότε δὴ μιν ἀναρπάξασα θύελλα

<sup>1</sup> On the topography of Phthiotis see Staehlin *Attik. Myth.* xxxi. 1 sq. (1906). It is curious that we hear of a *Κρόκιον πεδῖον*, not a *Κρόκιον ἄργος*.

<sup>2</sup> The Homeric phrase *βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἔχουσας* seems translated by the Hesiodic *παρὲς ἄλα ναυταῶνας*.



πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα φέρεν βάρεια στενάχοντα,  
 ἀγροῦ ἐπ' ἐσχατήν, ὅθι δώματα ναῖα Θυέστης  
 τὸ πρὶν, ἀτὰρ τότε ἔναϊε Θυεστιάδης Ἀγίσθος.  
 ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ καὶ κείμεν ἐφαίνετο νόστος ἀπήμων,  
 ἄψ' δὲ θεοὶ οὐδ' ὄρ' ἔσπευον καὶ οἶκαδ' ἔκοντο,  
 ᾗτοι ὁ μὲν χαίρων ἐπεβήσεται πατρίδος αἴης.

'Now thy brother escaped and avoided death on shipboard, for Hera saved him. But when he was soon about to come to the steep hill of Maleae, at that time a storm caught him and bare him out to sea, sore groaning, to the end of the land, where once Thyestes had his house and at that time Aegisthus, son of Thyestes, had his. But when there appeared a safe passage from that place also, and the Gods turned the wind, and they reached their home, he set foot on his fatherland.' The voyage was good as far as Malea; at Malea the storm caught him (as it caught Menelaus and Odysseus; it spared Nestor). Why did Agamemnon make for Malea? for the same reason that Nestor, Odysseus and Menelaus did,—that it lay between him and his home. This surely is absolutely plain. Modern commentators however, at least from Nitzsche to Mr. Agar, under the obsession of Tragic anachronisms, say to themselves 'welchen Weg hatte er also genommen, dass er eher auf Maleia zukam als an die heimische Küste von Argos und Mykenä?' What a route indeed! The rest of the voyage though elliptic is easy. It is elliptic because that is the ancient manner,<sup>1</sup> and we have had one storm off Malea already (γ 286) and are to have another (180). The wind 'blew him out to sea, to the end of the land'; Andron (*F.H.G.* ii. 350). said to Cythera, but this explanation is taken from the parallel experience of Odysseus, ι 81, where my family *a* actually read *παρέπλεγεν δὲ Κυθήροις*; and also an island can hardly be called *ἐσχατὴ γαίης*. 'The verge of the land' must have been some part of the coast which they managed to make, the hereditary portion of the younger branch of the house of Pelops. This may have been the later Messenia, as we see I 292-294 that Agamemnon is able to dispose of a number of towns on this coast. Here Agamemnon *quassas refecit rates* (Aegisthus of course was away from home, at Corinth or Mycenae, playing his own game),<sup>2</sup> and when the wind changed and heaven sent a good passage, he reached his home at the head of the Corinthian gulf without more adventure.

This is a consistent picture. I will add that it looks as though Menelaus also made his much-deferred homecoming to Corinth.<sup>3</sup> For 'the very day that Orestes buried his mother and Aegisthus, came valiant Menelaus,' *πολλὰ κτήματ' ἄγων ὅσα οἱ νέες ἄχθος ἄειραν*. And Telemachus' question implies he would naturally have been there, *ποῦ Μενέλαος ἔην*;—*ᾗ οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν Ἀχαικοῦ*; A great part of the Peloponnese, all except Argos, Triphylia, Arcadia and Elis

<sup>1</sup> Galen vi. 106 τὸ δὲ τῆς παλαιᾶς ἱερωνίας εἶδος οὕτως ἐστὶ βραχυλόγον ὥς πολλὰ πολλὰς υπερβαίνειν δοκεῖν τῇ λέξει τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἐκτετακμένων τοῦ λεγόμενου, sim. ix. 760, x. 275. What Galen felt of Ionic prose is true and even more true of Epos.

<sup>2</sup> And therefore need not, at Bothe's hands, endure transposition.

<sup>3</sup> Dictys vi. 2 puts Idomeneus and other heroes at Corinth when the war was over.

was more  
were given

2. An  
kingdom  
forces un  
which to  
many an  
imaginati  
Thessalia  
as they  
the Lapi  
regulation  
temple-a  
first that  
for Asia  
indeed,  
spot, as  
the ship  
ports of  
inlets or  
lands h  
locked  
were th  
the roa  
landed,  
roads o  
sailing  
to Auli  
put in  
sent fr  
A  
at Tro  
figure  
Catalo  
Aulis,  
book  
pology  
called  
like t  
his le  
selves  
they  
enough

was more or less directly dependent on Agamemnon. The princes of the house were given *terres*, independent as Menelaus, dependent (apparently) as Aegisthus.

2. Another circumstance of the Trojan War which fits in with Agamemnon's kingdom is the rendezvous of the international fleet at Aulis. Why did the forces under the hegemony of the King of Men collect at a port in a country which took no prominent part in the Trojan War? This question has drawn many and elaborate answers, of which the one most in accord with the higher imagination is that the locality is a survival from the original North Grecian or Thessalian Iliad, those spectres of the learned. In ancient matters, in proportion as they are ancient, reasons and causes are simple. What does the Stele under the Lapis Niger contain? Only, as far as the Latin can be made out, a police-regulation. Mr. Hogarth's silver plate from the slime of the Cayster bears a temple-account. The reason why the Greek armada rendezvoused at Aulis was first that Agamemnon had no port on the west coast of Greece. A fleet destined for Asia could not be asked to meet in the Corinthian Gulf. The princes indeed, at the preliminary ἀγερυός, met Agamemnon at Aegium, a very central spot, as central as Delphi, according to the local story (Paus. vii. 24. 2), but the ships naturally required an anchorage on the west. Agamemnon had no ports of his own, the later Nauplia if it existed belonged to Argolis; the Athenian inlets or Salamis might have afforded an anchorage, but would these little barren lands have provided the *avitaillement* of such an armada? The all but landlocked bays of the Euripus were obvious. Aulis and the neighbouring inlets were the port of Boeotia; hence the Aeolic migration started (Strabo 401). Here the road to Thebes and the pilgrims' way to Delphi began. If Cadmus ever landed, he landed here. In later times, when political circumstances made the roads of Aulis no longer free, Geraestus in Euboea was a rendezvous for a fleet sailing to Asia. Agesilaus, reminded of Agamemnon, transferred his anchorage to Aulis, and offended the Thebans by doing so. At Aulis Demetrius Poliorcetes put in (Diod. xx. 100). A potentate who had to collect a fleet of 1186 sail, sent from all parts of Greece, would naturally choose the Euripus.

Another question has been asked: Why do the Boeotians, who cut no figure at Troy, take the first place in the *Catalogue*? Not because they cut a better figure in some earlier epos, or in some earlier stage of this epos, but because the *Catalogue*, as is plain, represents the original arrangement of the contingents at Aulis, and was taken by Homer from its place and time in saga to his second book and to the Troad. (And hence, in case anyone with Mr. Murray, *Anthropology and the Classics*, p. 67, doubts if 'the Cypria as a poem can definitely be called later than the Iliad,' there is no Greek Catalogue in the Cypria, which like the rest of the Cycle was conditioned body and soul by Homer, and took his leavings.) The Boeotians as masters of the soil and the waters, gave themselves the first place in the fleet. We may conjecture that with their fifty sail they filled the ὄρμος of Aulis, which according to Strabo 403 is only large enough πεντήκοντα πλοίοις, and that the rest occupied the inlets on both coasts.

And thirdly, why is the whole *Catalogue* referred to as *Βοιωτία*? The answer to this is easy; according to the Greek custom, familiar in scholastic matters (of which this is one), of quoting a series of things by the first of them: e.g. schol. A Γ 277 [ἡ διπλῇ] πρὸς τὴν ἀθέτησιν τῶν ἐν Ὀδυσσεΐᾳ ὡκεία δ' ἡελίῳ ὑπερίου ἄγγελος ἦλθεν. The athetesis covered sixteen lines. Apoll. Dysc. *pronom.* 109. 20 Schneider τὸ μέντοι ἀλλ' αἰεὶ φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἔχων ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐμαῖς εὐλόγως ὑπ' Ἀριστάρχου ὑπωπτεύετο ὡς νόθον. Four lines (v. 320-323) were athetised.

The later Ὀμηρικοί never completely realised prae-Dorian history in this respect. They wavered between the prevailing political conception of a single Dorian Argos, and the statements in Homer. Strabo 372 recognises Agamemnon's northern possessions but adds καὶ δὴ καὶ τὴν Ἀργολικὴν τῇ Μυκηναίᾳ προσέθηκεν, the exact contrary of the truth. Pausanias ii. 4. 2, his mind full of different Corinthian traditions, is aware that the Corinthians were not an independent nation at the siege of Troy, but conceives of them as subject to the 'dynasts at Mycenae or Argos.' Ephorus (*fr.* 28 = Strabo 462) must be given the credit of facing the facts and inventing a story to account for Agamemnon as well as Diomedes being king of Argos. It is that while Diomedes with most of his men was away on a campaign in Acarnania, Agamemnon seized Argolis; but when the Trojan war broke out, he recalled Diomedes ἐπὶ τε τὴν Ἀργεὺς ἀπόληψιν καὶ τὴν κοινωσίαν τοῦ πολέμου. This is a real 'combination,' a type of the genus, and a good contrast to the unadapted statements of epos.

These are the political conditions, in the Iliad, of the district afterwards known as Argos and Argolis. We must next examine the usage of the word in Homer. First it denotes as in later times the valley of the Inachus, both the town (B 559) and the district (γ 180). This is its sense in the story of Theoclymenus ο 224, 239, 240 (Argolis whence Amphiaras started for Thebes), and in Diomedes' mouth Z 224 Ξ 119 (πατήρ δ' ἐμὸς Ἀργεὶ νάσθη). The Argos which Hera loved Δ 52 is presumably that in sight of her temple; and this is the meaning of her title Ἀργεῖη Δ 8 E 908 (local, in antithesis to Ἀλακκομένης Ἀθήνη). An epithet is devoted to Argolis T 114:

Ἥρῃ δ' αἶξασα λίπεν ρίον Οὐλύμποιο,  
καρπαλίμως δ' ἔκετ' Ἀργος Ἀχαιῶκον ἐνθ' ἄρα ἦδ' ἔ  
ἰφθίμην ἄλοχον Σθενέλου Περσηίδαο.

The claims of the Perseidae to be Achaeans are not obvious, but their story connects them with Mycenae, and to make light of the passage would be to fall into the petitio principii which belongs as of right to advanced interpretation. To Argolis on the same ground belongs Ἀργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον O 30 in a Heracles-episode, and probably Argos the town φ 108. The phrase Achaeans Argos however occurs also in Agamemnon's mouth I 141

εἰ δέ κεν Ἀργος ἰκοίμεθ' Ἀχαιῶκον, οὐθαρ ἀρούρης,  
γαμβρός κέν μοι εἴη,

where he is thinking of his own kingdom, his three daughters and the seven Messenian villages he will give as dowry. It would be hard to make Ἀργος

Ἀχαιῶκον  
large.  
Ἀργεος  
interpre  
and Ho  
that the  
Men ha  
Ἀργος  
and son  
is not  
kingdon

Sisyphu  
combin  
as 'at  
argos, c  
τ' ἀνὰ  
was cal  
coast v  
passage  
the Ae  
remains  
ἱστορεῖ  
λαβόντ  
τῶν Ἑλ  
νικήσαν  
Wi  
express  
or whe  
ἱππόβο  
is to t  
plain o  
εἰ τὸ μ  
968).

<sup>1</sup> For the  
read with  
reading 'A  
w 37. To  
read ἐκεί  
ἔστι

<sup>2</sup> It sur  
that Cori  
a μοῖρα  
here call  
ἐκ Σικυών

'Αχαϊκὸν οὐθαρ ἀρούρης refer to a castle on a hill; it is his fertile land at large. The question put by Telemachus γ 249 ποῦ Μενέλαος ἔην; . . . ἢ οὐκ Ἄργεος ἦεν Ἀχαϊκοῦ ἀλλά πῃ ἄλλη πλάζετ' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους; can only be interpreted of Mycenae if we insist that Agamemnon's murder took place there; and Homer neither states nor implies this. *Prima facie* it is more probable that the ambush and the slaughter took place at Corinth before the King of Men had time to look round.<sup>1</sup> We see therefore that in one case Ἀχαϊκὸν Ἄργος means Argolis, in a second Agamemnon's kingdom which is not Argolis, and some place in Agamemnon's kingdom in a third. The epithet therefore is not distinctive as between Corinth and Argolis. Now that Agamemnon's kingdom could be called Ἄργος appears from Z 152

ἔστι πόλις Ἐφύρη मुखῶ Ἄργεος ἱπποβότῳ,  
εἴνα δὲ Σίσυφος ἔσκει.

Sisyphus is firmly connected with Corinth and with no other place. Mr. Leaf's combinations (ad l.) cannot be allowed. We must admit that Corinth is described as 'at the end of the plain.' The Agamemnonian kingdom was in fact an argos, or a succession of arge, a riviera, a plain or plains by the sea; αἰγιαλὸν τ' ἀνὰ πάντα is part of its entry in the *Catalogue*; one of the Sicyonian tribes was called Αἰγιαλεῖς (Herod. v. 51). The word as a specific designation of this coast was superseded in historical times by Ἀχαΐα, but it survives in one passage.<sup>2</sup> In the version of the oracle quoted above given by Ion and Mnaseas the Aegians not the Megarians were the applicants; a portion of this version remains in two articles in Suidas, Αἰγίεις and Ὑμείς. In the latter it is said ἱστορεῖ δὲ Μνασείας ὅτι Αἰγίεις οἱ ἐν Ἀχαΐᾳ κατανανμαχίσαντες Αἰτωλοῦς καὶ λαβόντες πεντηκόντορον αὐτῶν δεκάτην Πυθοὶ ἀνατιθέντες ἡρώτων τίνες εἶεν κρείττους τῶν Ἑλλήνων. In the shorter version s. Αἰγίεις we read οἱ γὰρ ἐν Ἀργεὶ Αἰγίεις νικήσαντες κτλ. Of the two Ἀχαΐα is the gloss.

With so much ascertained we can give a definite meaning to Agamemnon's expressions. When he calls his kingdom Ἄργος Ἀχαϊκὸν οὐθαρ ἀρούρης I 141, 283, or when it is said of Aegisthus γ 263 he wooed Agamemnon's wife मुखῶ Ἄργεος ἱπποβότῳ (whether the courting took place at Corinth or Mycenae), the reference is to the fertility of the north coast of Peloponnesus, especially the broader plain of Corinth and Sicyon. The fame of this fertility survives in the proverb εἰ τὸ μέσον κτήσαιο Κορίνθου καὶ Σικυῶνος (εὐφορος γὰρ ἡ χώρα schol. Ar. *Birds* 968). Ἱππόβοτος<sup>3</sup> is justified by the story of Pegasus and Bellerophon, the

<sup>1</sup> For ἐκὰς Ἄργεος γ 260 the sense shows we must read with the minority of the MSS. ἐκὰς ὁρσεος. The reading Ἄργεος was brought by ἐκὰς from I 146 δ 99 w 37. To avoid the neglect of the digamma we may read ἐκὰ with Bekker or ἐνὶ with Mr. Agar.

<sup>2</sup> It survives also in Pausanias, who distinctly says that Corinth (ii. 1. 1) and Sicyon (ib. 7. 1) are each a μοῖρα τῆς Ἀργείας; viii. 1. 2 he defines what he here calls Ἀργολίς by saying it includes Sicyon, μετὰ δὲ Σικυῶνα Ἀχαῖοι τὸ ἐντέθεν εἰσιν. The coincidence

between these passages and the usage of the term in Homer cannot be denied; but it is not plain if Pausanias uses the word geographically or politically; in the second passage (ii. 7. 1) he appears to conceive the name as a mark and result of the conquests of Dorian Argos.

<sup>3</sup> Like other epic attributes it is not superlative or exclusive. The predication is made without reference. Land near Chalcis was called ἡ ἱππώβοτος, the Horse-mead, Ael. *V.H.* vi. 1.

invention of the bridle (Pindar *Ol.* 13), the trademarks koppa (Corinth) and sampi (Sicyon). The attribute πολυδίψιον Δ 171 is no hindrance; any Mediterranean land watered by short torrents falling at a considerable slope and turning into *ghiarre* in the summer may be called thirsty. The Achaean riviera had a better title to the epithet than Argolis, with its swamp and its water-snake.<sup>1</sup> The Italian Marche are an example of a land which is at once thirsty and fertile. When Agamemnon A 30 says *ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ ἐν Ἀργεῖ* (and sim. B 115 I 22) he refers to his *παράλια*, and so Idomeneus N 378 *δοῖμεν δ' Ἀτρεΐδαο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστην Ἀργεος ἐξαγαγόντες ὀπιούμεν*.

We may notice some other possibly local usages.

Menelaus δ 174 sq. tells Telemachus how he would like to have brought his father bodily to his own country and settled him near him:

καὶ κέ οἱ Ἀργεῖ νάσσα πόλιν καὶ δώματ' ἔτευξα  
ἐξ Ἰθάκης ἀγαγὼν σὺν κτήμασι καὶ τεκεῖ ᾧ  
καὶ πᾶσιν λαοῖσι, μίαν πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξας  
αἱ περιναεταόουσιν ἀνάσσονται δ' ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ.  
καὶ κε θάμ' ἐνθάδ' ἔοντες ἐμισγόμεθ'.

This is all very local, there is no question of Argolis or 'Achaea.' Is *ἀργεῖ* used *ὀνομαστικῶς*, as 'the plain,' or the delta of the Eurotas?

Hector, foreseeing his wife's fate, Z 456, says:

καὶ κεν ἐν Ἀργεῖ εὐῶσα πρὸς ἄλλης ἰστὸν ὑφαίνοισ,  
καὶ κεν ὕδωρ φορέοις Μεσσηίδος ἢ Ὑπερείης  
πόλλ' αἰεξαζομένη.

Did Hector mean the whole passage generically?—the middle and the upper well? or, as seems more epical, did the saga-poet take these names from some town of his acquaintance and put them into Hector's mouth? and what town? The same or similar names are common. *Ὑπερησία* was the old name of Aegira in 'Achaea' (Strabo 383, Paus. vii. 26. 2); *Μεσσηίς* was a fountain at Therapne (*ib.* iii. 20. 1) and *Ὑπερεία* at Troezen (*ib.* ii. 30. 8); both were pointed out by the Pharsalians (Strabo 432), and a well Hyperea existed *ἐν μέσῃ τῇ Φεραίων πόλει* (*ib.* 439 Pindar Pyth. iv. 125), and another is mentioned in Eurypylus' section in the *Catalogue* B 734. These two localities therefore throw no light on the *Ἀργος* in question, if it be specific; but Hector would probably imagine his wife becoming Agamemnon's slave. Lastly, what does the famous predication of Agamemnon mean

πολλῇσιν νήσοισι καὶ Ἀργεῖ παντὶ ἀνάσσειν?

We have seen what his actual kingdom was; but 'my whole coast' is no great title; nor is it likely, if possible, to take *παντὶ* distributively, 'every valley' (and the Iason argos was not his): the other member shews that *Ἀργος* means more. There are no islands attached to 'Achaea,' the Argolic islands belonged

<sup>1</sup> Aristotle *Meteor.* 352 a 8 said Argolis was *ἐλώδης* and uncultivated in heroic days.

to Sthenelus; Cerigo and Cerigotto, possessions no doubt of Menelaus, can hardly count as 'many.' It is plain we must interpret the line of the hegemony of Agamemnon, the peoples who answered to his call. The 'islands' are the islands duly registered in the *Catalogue*, Cos, Carpathus, etc., 'Ἄργος is the land, from Oloosson to Lacedaemon.

Beside these specific uses of the term, there are also the general uses, in which 'Ἄργος means Greece and 'Ἀργεῖοι Greeks. The substantive occurs in this sense at B 287, 348, H 363, I 246, M 70, N 227, O 372, T 229, Ω 437, δ 99, ω 37 (H 363 said by Paris conceivably meant Lacedaemon). Among the speakers are Achilles and Nestor; the term therefore was natural in the mouth of the former. The adjective everyone knows is an equivalent of 'Ἀχαιοί and Δαναοί; the only exceptions are 'Ἡρῇ 'Ἀργεῖη, 'Ἀργεῖον Δαναῶν θ 578 and possibly 'Ἀργεῖη 'Ελένη.

## IV.

What is the relation between the specific and the general sense of the word? Did the latter grow out of the former, and by what process?

The ancients answered this question by saying that Argos in Homer meant the Peloponnese, Argos Achaicum meant the same thing, and Argos Pelasgicum meant Thessaly. The latter two phrases we have examined. That Argos by itself was the name of Peloponnesus is, so stated, an untenable proposition. We know of no word ἄργος except ἄργος=πεδῖον and cannot assume another without this original meaning; and that Peloponnesus was ever called connotatively 'Plain' is impossible: no land so little deserved the name as the mountainous, indented, wooded island of Pelops. The statement is an induction from the usage of Homer, and a bad induction; the terms in Homer cover more than Peloponnesus. 'Ἀργεῖοι, like Δαναοί or κούροι 'Αχαιῶν, includes the whole host, islanders and North-Greeks. 'Ἄργος T 329 is the country which Achilles is not to see again. Argos and Argivi connote the whole Greek country and the whole of its inhabitants. How did it come to do this if its intrinsic meaning is not true of the Peloponnese, and even less true of the islands?

Significant names appear to be bestowed on places in two ways: (a) when they really apply; for instance \*Hlās, Holland, Iceland, Piemonte, Canton du Valais; (b) when they do not apply, or no longer apply; e.g. England Switzerland, Romagna. The former process may be called natural, the latter political. The application of the term Argos to Greece at large is clearly not natural; I suggest that it was a political term. In Italian clerical circles it is still the fashion to call the actual kingdom, government and army of Italy 'Piedmontese'; circumstances can be conceived—suppose the Holy See had moved to Malta or to Corsica—when Italy might have been known as Piemonte. The spread of a name really belonging to a place or people to a place and people to which it does not belong, is a commonplace even in the ancient



world; in Greece the expansion and contraction of the terms Achaea and Hellas are typical. Now the term Argos in Homer occurs, besides the passages we have already quoted, in two antitheses to exactly these words:

ἀν' Ἑλλάδα καὶ μέσον Ἄργος α 344 δ 726, 816 ο 80  
 Ἄργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον καὶ Ἀχαιῖδα καλλιγύναϊκα Γ 75, 258.

Hellas in Homer is a district to the north of the upper waters of the Spercheus; when Greek literature begins again, it connotes the whole Greek race. Achaea and Achaean in Homer mean the race, in later history the word is limited to the coast between Pagasae and cape Posidium, and to the north coast of Peloponnesus. The steps of the process cannot be given, but the beginning and the end of that process, contrary in either case, are plain. The antitheses between these two terms and Argos show that Argos is a third example of the genus. It combines with Hellas and again with Achaeis to express in a figurative way, the whole of Greece. It is therefore the kind of place-name which we may expect to find both local and general. Now mediaeval history fortunately explains itself; we know why and how a Danish tribe settled on our east coast gave its name to our island. The various Englefields discernible in Berkshire do not darken our historical eye, and we find canton Schwyz compatible with the country Schweiz. We accept also the fact, obscure though it is, that the Romans chose the unknown Γραικοί by whom to designate the Hellenic race. What local Argives, and by what process, asserted their right to give the Greeks an immortal name?

Does the change date from the Achaean or Homeric world? Was Agamemnon with his Myceno-Corinthian kingdom, his argos, so important that the Greeks as his subjects were called Ἀργεῖοι? Hardly; we must not exaggerate the overlordship of the ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν, whose position, with its undeniable prerogatives, has been defined by Mr. Lang (*Homer and his Age* c. 4 and 5, *Anthropology and the Classics* p. 51 sq.). Or did the Inachian Argos supply the Greeks with a single name? Not during the Achaean period, when it was of no particular importance and did not belong to the Overlord.

There are however indications that 'Argos' held a different position before the day of the Atridae. The castles of Mycenae and Tiryns can hardly have been originally in different hands, and the Argolis-valley is connected with the northern watershed by a system of narrow paved and bridged roads. Paving, as Prof. E. Meyer (*Gesch. d. Alt.* ii. 170, 180) observes, implies the passage of chariots, that is to say a military not a commercial thoroughfare. Mere goods can be conveyed along unpaved bridlepaths on beasts or on men's backs—as took place between the Valtellina and the Engadine, and the Engadine and Davos till not long ago. Now a strategic or military road over a pass implies that both ends of it belong to the same power. The tunnel under the col de Fréjus, which we call the Mont Cenis, was made by the kingdom of Sardinia at a time when Savoy and Piedmont were in the same hands, and to unite two parts of the same country. The North German canal connects German waters. In

Agamemnon  
 doubt val  
 of itself t  
 these trac  
 hands, and  
 from one  
 and receiv  
 of its nam  
 clearly the  
 (B.S.A. m  
 Melos, ca  
 Glotta i.  
 name to  
 inconsiste  
 The Ach  
 however  
 race gave  
 now to n  
 Dukes of  
 The new  
 quest of  
 wide sens  
 an earlier  
 race-name  
 nothing c  
 is largely  
 American  
 on the ot  
 The full  
 Ἀργεῖοι;  
 older wor  
 Δαῖοι m  
 Danaï of  
 attacked.  
 most sou  
 dependen  
 Greece, a  
 the swart  
 Acco  
 MM. Pee  
 A.M., th  
 Boeotia t  
 is the M  
 NO. X.



Agamemnon's day Mycenae, his only possession on the southern side, was no doubt valuable, whether for pleasure or for safety; but it does not seem enough of itself to account for these elaborate communications. At the period when these tracks were paved Argolis and Corinth, the two arge, were in the same hands, and it was found worth while to provide for the speedy shifting of troops from one sea to the other. Such a kingdom, holding the *claustra Peloponnesi* and receiving the traffic of two worlds, might have given a political extension of its name to the whole country, North and South. The race who did so were clearly the people who built the castles of Argolis, who according to Dr. Mackenzie (*B.S.A.* 1906-7, p. 425) put an end to the empire of Cnossus and colonised Melos, call we them Mycenaeans, Pelasgians, or Ionians (with Kretschmer *Glotta* i. 9 sq.). Their Argos was not 'Αχαϊκόν; the incoming race added this name to the old word. 'Αργος, like Phthia, remained a place-name, strictly inconsistent, like Provence or Lombardy, with actual political circumstances. The Achaeans divided the original kingdom, why we do not know (we know however why Savoy was given to Napoleon III.), the Hegemon of the new race gave up Argolis with the exception of Mycenae, and the paved roads led now to nothing but the 'summerpalace' with the tombs of the old kings. The Dukes of Savoy sleep in French soil, but then they were not buried at Modane. The new Corinthian dynasty recouped itself by expanding westwards; the conquest of Sicyon has its echo in the *Catalogue* (B 572). I submit then that the wide sense of Argos and Argive, meaning Greece and Greek, is a survival from an earlier prae-Achaeon civilisation. It is remarkable that while the other two race-names 'Αχαιοί and Δαναοί have their equivalents on foreign monuments, nothing corresponding to 'Αργεῖοι has been found. Nomenclature among nations is largely traditional and conventional; our diplomatic title is British, and the Americans and our colonists style us Britishers, but it is not a name we affect; on the other hand we are singular in calling the inhabitants of Holland Dutch. The full name of prae-Achaeon Greeks may have been longer than the simple 'Αργεῖοι; the Greeks may have abbreviated the term, while foreigners kept the older word. As 'Αχαιοί belongs to the new race, possibly the remaining term Δαναοί may have been the real old race-name, and the full style 'Αργεῖοι Δαναοί, Danaï of Argos. The combination survives, θ 578, where it has been needlessly attacked. What in the other antithesis 'Αχαιῖς means who shall say? The most southern point at which the name is fossilised in history is Agamemnon's dependency. In the phrase however it may mean northern as against southern Greece, and καλλιγύναικα may attest the effect of the blonde Achaeon belle upon the swarthy Mycenaean.

According to Mr. Dawkin's *compte rendu*, *J.H.S.* 1908, pp. 323, 324, MM. Peet, Wace and Thompson, *C.R.* 1908, 236, and Mr. Wace in the current *A.M.*, the late stone age lasted longer in south Thessaly, Phthiotis and North Boeotia than elsewhere in Greece; that is to say the Bronze civilisation, which is the Mycenaean, arrived there comparatively late. These are exactly the

districts to which the names Hellas and Achaea clung. In Homer there is no distinction, in manners, language or race, between one part of Greece and another, there is nothing to account for the antithesis between Argos and Hellas or Achaeis. If an excavation shews at one time during the Mycenaean period the boundary of North and South Greece was drawn a little south of the Cephissus beyond which for a long time the bronze culture of Argos or Mycenae did not penetrate, is not the antithesis accounted for? It is a survival in Homer from the flourishing days of the Mycenaean monarchy when the people of Achaea and Hellas were a kind of Picts and Scots.<sup>1</sup> The permanence of the name Achaea in this district also suggests that the Achaeans may have settled there for some time before they made their further advance southward.

After the Dorian conquest had moved away Pelasgian and Achaeans alike, the Dorian state of Argos appropriated the name and its associations. Corinth, except for one brief moment,<sup>2</sup> was never called Argos again. The Achaeans name however clung to the shore of the Corinthian gulf. The conception that Agamemnon was king of Argos and Nauplia was consecrated by Tragedy, not more ignorant of the sentiment than of the facts of the heroic age. Its evidence is justly decried by Plutarch *Thesius* 16, 28, 29 and Pausanias i. 3. 3, 28. 7, 30. 4.

T. W. ALLEN.

<sup>1</sup>If Zerelia is not Itonos, is it Arne? Hesiod in the *Aspis* places it in this region (cf. *C.R.* 1906, 200). Such an ancient site (if it goes back to 3000 B.C.) would leave a name when it had ceased to be inhabited. Contrariwise the site Glä in Boeotia remains, but without a name (I suggested Γλήχωρ, *C.R.* 1902, 239). Further, do the epithets Argos

πelasγιῶν and Larissa πηλασγία recall a moment when the Pelasgian frontier was more northerly, namely at Othrys? Frontier places, like Mezzo Lombardo, are often labelled.

<sup>2</sup>Xen. *Hell.* iv. 4. 6 αἰσθανόμενοι ἀφανίζουμένην τὴν πόλιν διὰ τὸ καὶ θροῦς ἀνασπᾶσθαι καὶ Ἄργος ἀπὸ Κορίνθου τὴν πατρίδα αὐτοῖς ὀνομάζεσθαι.

EM

STR  
πέραν τῶ  
τοὺς Θρά  
Μάγνητας  
sense, bu  
Read εἶ

i. 3  
τὴν θάλα  
διέχοντος

i. 4  
ὅτι σφα  
δόξειεν.

ii.  
τὴν οἴκη  
opposite  
Read τ

iii.  
φερόμενοι  
θαλάττιοι  
παρὰ is  
that this  
See Kra

iii.  
γὰρ τὸ  
regarded  
fused as

iii.  
τὴν παρ  
γὰρ φάν

there is no  
and another,  
d Hellas or  
n period the  
the Cephisus  
Iycenae did  
il in Homer  
le of Achaea  
of the name  
settled there

haean alike,  
s. Corinth,  
haean name  
that Aga-  
y, not more  
evidence is  
, 30. 4.

. ALLEN.

recall a moment  
more northerly,  
es, like Mezo

φανιζομένην τὴν  
καὶ Ἄργος ἀντι-  
τι.

## EMENDATIONS IN STRABO AND PLUTARCH'S MORALIA.

### I. STRABO (*Kramer's text*).

STRABO i. 2. 20. ἢ τὴν Θράκην οὐκ οἶδε (sc. ὁ Ὀμηρος) μὴ προπίπτουσιν  
πέραν τῶν Παιονικῶν καὶ Θετταλικῶν ὁρῶν; ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐφεξῆς κατὰ  
τοὺς Θράκας εἰδώς, καὶ τοῦ κατονομάζων τὴν τε παραλίαν καὶ τὴν μεσογαίαν  
Μάγνητας μὲν τινὰς . . . καταλέγει κ.τ.λ. It is true that οὐ is contrary to the  
sense, but those who reject it should explain how it came into the passage.  
Read εἰ κατονομάζων . . .

i. 3. 15. συγχωρήσας δὲ τῷ μετεωρισμῷ τοῦ ἐδάφους συμμετεωρισθεῖσαν καὶ  
τὴν θάλατταν ἐπικλύσαι τοὺς μέχρι τοῦ μαντείου τόπους, πλεόν τῃ ἀπὸ θαλάττης  
διέχοντος τῶν τρισχιλίων σταδίων. Read πλεόν τι . . . (H=τι, as often).

i. 4. I. καὶ περὶ τοῦ σχήματος δ' ἐν τοῖς ἐξῆς διὰ πλειόνων ἢ καὶ δεικνύς,  
ὅτι σφαιροειδὴς καὶ ἡ γῆ σὺν τῇ ὑγρᾷ φύσει καὶ ὁ οὐρανός, ἀλλοτριολογεῖν ἂν  
δόξειεν. No greater change is required than καταδεικνύς.

ii. i. 18. οὗτος δὲ Πιθία πιστεύειν κατὰ τὰ ἰνσιώτερα τῆς Βρετανικῆς  
τὴν οἴκησιν ταύτην τίθῃσι. All editors agree that the context requires the  
opposite word. But to substitute τὰ ἀρκτικώτερα is out of the question.  
Read τὰ ἀνώτερα (or rather τὰ ἀνώτερα, which was misdivided).

iii. 2. 7. καὶ οἱ θύνουσι δ' ὅσῳ πλεόν συνεγγίζουσι ταῖς Στήλαις ἔξωθεν  
φερόμενοι, τοσῶδ' ἰσχυαίνονται πλεόν, τῆς τροφῆς ἐπιλειπούσης· εἶναι τε ἢ παρὰ  
θαλάττιον ἐν τῷ ζῶον τοῦτο. εἶναι has no construction and παρὰ no sense.  
παρὰ is a misreading of the compendium for παροιμία: 'it is a saying  
that this creature is the sea-pig'. The saying is known from Athenaeus.  
See Kramer here.

iii. 2. 8. τὸν μὲν ἄργυρον ἀποκαίεσθαι τὸν δὲ χρυσὸν ὑπομένειν· ἐνδιάχυτος  
γὰρ τὸ τύπος καὶ λιθώδης. Coraes reads λιπώδης. For the rest, ὁ τύπος is  
regarded as desperate. Read ἐνδιάχυτος γὰρ τὸ ὕφος . . . It is easily  
fused as to its 'texture'.

iii. 3. 3. ἢ δὲ καὶ τὸν Ἀριστοτέλη φησὶν ὁ Ποσειδώνιος οὐκ ὀρθῶς αἰτιασθαι  
τὴν παραλίαν καὶ τὴν Μαυρουσίαν τῶν πλημμυρίδων καὶ τῶν ἀμπώσεων παλιρροεῖν  
γὰρ φάναι τὴν θάλατταν διὰ τὸ τὰς ἄκρας ὑψηλὰς τε καὶ τραχείας εἶναι, δεχομένας

τε τὸ κύμα σκληρῶς καὶ ἀταποδιδοῦσας τῇ ἰβηρίᾳ. It is admitted that Ἰβηρία is nonsense. The copyist is engaged in writing about Ἰβηρία and it is natural that he should make this mistake for . . . καὶ ἀταποδιδοῦσας τῇ ἰση βίᾳ. The earlier corruption in the passage may be emended with . . . τὴν <Ἰβηρικὴν> παραλίαν.

iv. 4. 5. πρόσεστι δὲ τῇ ἀνοίᾳ καὶ τὸ βάριβαρον καὶ τὸ ἔκφυλον, ὃ τοῖς προσβάροις ἔθνεσι παρακολουθεῖ πλείστον, τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς μάχης ἀπίνοντας τὴν κεφαλὰς τῶν πολεμίων ἐξάπτειν ἐκ τῶν αἰχμίων τῶν ἵππων, κομίσαντας δὲ προσπαταλεῖν τὴν ἰθέαν τοῖς προφυλαίοις. Read τὴν θήραν. (Cf. the ἄγρα of Agave in the *Bacchae*.)

v. 2. 5. μεταξύ δὲ Δούνης καὶ Πίσσης ὁ Μάκρης ἐστὶ ἰχωρίον, ᾧ πέρατι τῆς Τυρρηνίας καὶ τῆς Λιγυστικῆς κέχρηται. The conjectures ποτάμιον (Kramer), χειμάρρους (Madvig), are scarcely so near as χαράδριον.

v. 3. 1. ἔστωται δὲ δι' αὐτῶν ἡ Σαλαρία ὁδὸς οὐ πολλὴ οὔσα. Kramer rightly objects to this as contrary to the fact. Nor is the word suitable. Read οὐ φύλην.

v. 4. 13. ἐπὶ τοσούτων γὰρ τεύδ' ἐτρήφθησαν, ὥστ' ἐπὶ δειπνον ἐκάλουν πρὸς ζεύγη μονομάχων. Read ἐξετρήφθησαν.

vi. 1. 1. ἐντεύθεν δ' ἐκπλέοντι τὸν πόντον νῆσος Λευκωσία. Both geography and expression require . . . ἐκπλέοντι πρὸς νότον . . .

vi. 3. 1. ἔστι δ' ἰεπιερρονησιάζουσα ἡ Μεσσαπία. Read ὑποχ. It is 'rather peninsular'.

vi. 3. 2. A conspiracy has been formed—τούτων δ' ἦν καὶ Φάλανθος, ὅσπερ ἐδόκει προστάτης ὑπάρχειν αὐτῶν, οὐκ ἠρέσκετο δ' ἀπλῶς τοῖς περὶ τῆς βουλῆς ἰονομοσθεῖσι. Madvig's δογματισθεῖσι is remote, and the νομοσθεῖσι of Coraes is weak. Read συνομοσθεῖσι.

x. 1. 15. τῶν δ' ἐκ Τροίας ἐπανιόντων Εὐβοέων τινὲς εἰς Ἰλλυρίους ἐκπεσόντες, ἴ' Ἀβαντες οἴκαδε διὰ τῆς Μακεδονίας περὶ Ἐδεσσαν ἔμειναν. Read ἄραντες. They 'started'.

x. 3. 8. ἡ δὲ ἐνόπλιος ὄρχησις στρατιωτικὴ, ἡ καὶ ἡ πυρρίχη δηλοῖ καὶ ὁ Πύρριχος, ὃν φασιν εὐρετὴν εἶναι τῆς τοιαύτης ἀσκήσεως τῶν νέων καὶ τὰ στρατιωτικά. The sense required is in the first place <ὡς> καὶ ἡ πυρρίχη . . . , and in the second καινοῦντα τὰ στρατιωτικά.

xi. 2. 6. ἐνταῦθα δ' ἐστὶν ὁ στενώτατος πορθμὸς τοῦ στόματος τῆς Μαιωτίδος, ὅσον εἴκοσι σταδίων ἢ πλείονος, ἔχων ἐν τῇ περαίᾳ κόμην τὸ Μυρμήκιον. πλησίον δ' ἐστὶ τοῦ Ἰ' Ἡρακλείου καὶ τὸ Παρθένιον. As τὸ Ἡρακλείου has not been mentioned, not only is its introduction abrupt, but καὶ has no meaning. Read τοῦ κλείθρου, i.e. the said narrowest part of the entrance.

xi. 5. 1. They say of the Amazons that they live τὸν μὲν ἄλλον χρόνον

καθ' αὐτὰ  
τὴν νομα  
πλεονάζει  
Read τῶν

xi.  
σχήματι  
τῶν αὐτῶν  
δ' αὐτῶν

xi.  
τοῦ μὲν  
I am co  
represent  
may resto

xii.  
τύπωμα  
after the

PLU  
Πυθαγόρου  
περιγεγο  
καταφρον  
emend th  
σεμνόν κα  
nor does  
should re  
διώκοντες,

Μοι  
πύρρωθεν  
ἄγουσα  
καταδραμ  
I should

Μοι  
πυθόμενος  
τὴν ἐλ  
the exte

Μοι  
πλατύ

# EMENDATIONS IN STRABO AND PLUTARCH'S MORALIA 101

καθ' αὐτὰς αὐτουργούσας ἕκαστα, τὰ τε πρὸς ἄροτον καὶ φυτουργίαν καὶ τὰ πρὸς τὴν νομάς, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἵππων, τὰς δ' ἀκιμωτάτας τῶν ἵππων κυνηγεσίαις πλεονάζειν καὶ τὰ πολέμια ἀσκέειν. Some MSS give ἐφ' ἵππων for τῶν ἵππων. Read τῶν ἐφ' ἵβων.

xi. 6. 3. ψήθησαν καὶ αὐτοὶ παρέξασθαι τὴν γραφὴν ἡδεῖαν, εἰς ἐν ἱστορίας σχήματι λέγων ἃ μὴδέποτε εἶδον μίτε ἤκουσαν, ἢ οὐ παρά γε εἰδῶτων, σκοποῦντες τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ μόνον τοῦτο, ὅτι ἀκρόασιν ἡδεῖαν ἔχει καὶ θαυμαστήν. Read σκοποῦντες δ' αὐτὸ δὲ μόνον τοῦτο, ὅτι κ.τ.λ.

xi. 7. 2. καὶ τὰ διὰ τὸ μὲν εἶδος τῆς εὐδαιμονίας σημεία ἡγοῦνται. al. καὶ τοῦ μὲν εἶδους, οἱ καὶ ταῦτα μὲν τοῦ εἶδους. The words are without meaning. I am convinced that τοῦ μὲν εἶδους contains τοῦ μεγέθους and that διὰ represents <ν> Δία. Accepting the conjecture διηγούνται (see Kramer) we may restore καὶ <ν> Δία τοῦ μεγέθους τῆς εὐδαιμονίας σημεία <δι>ηγούνται.

xii. 8. 19. ἡ δὲ μεταξὺ Λαοδικείας καὶ Ἀπαμείας λίμνη καὶ βορβορώδῃ καὶ ὑπόνομον τὴν ἀποφορὰν ἔχει. Read καὶ <καθ'> ὑπόνομον. It has a smell after the manner of a sewer.

## II. PLUTARCH'S MORALIA (Bernardakis' text).

PLUTARCH *Mor.* 44 B πολλοὶ γὰρ εἰσιν οἱ κακῶς καὶ παρὰ μέλος τὴν Πυθαγόρου φωνὴν ὑπολαμβάνοντες. ἐκείνος μὲν γὰρ ἐκ φιλοσοφίας ἔφησεν αὐτῷ περιγεγονέναι τὸ μὴδὲν θαυμάζειν οὔτοι δὲ τὸ μὴδὲν ἐπαινεῖν μὴδὲ τιμᾶν, ἐν τῷ καταφρονεῖν<sup>†</sup> τίθεμενοι καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν ὑπεροψία διώκοντες. Bernardakis would emend the last clause by transposing καὶ, thus, ἐν τῷ καταφρονεῖν τίθεμενοι τὸ σεμνὸν καὶ ὑπεροψία διώκοντες. The corruption does not appear very probable, nor does the language as emended sound to me very much like Plutarch. I should read ἐν τῷ καταφρονεῖν <τὸ φρονεῖν> τίθεμενοι καὶ τὸ σεμνὸν ὑπεροψία διώκοντες.

*Mor.* 160 F (The dolphins bearing Arion are approaching the coast.) πόρρωθεν ἀφωρῶντο φρίκη κατιούσα παρὰ τὴν ἄκραν, ἀφρόν τινα καὶ ψόφον ἄγουσα τῷ ῥοθίῳ περὶ αὐτὴν πολὺν, ὥστε πάντας ἐπὶ τὸν τόπον οἱ προσέμελλε καταδραμεῖν θαυμάσαντας. The correction προσβάλλειν ἐμελλε lacks neatness. I should prefer προσέκελλε.

*Mor.* 221 C Ἡρώνας, Ἀθήνησιν ἀλόντος τινὸς γραφὴν ἀργίας, παρὸν καὶ τυθόμενος ἐκέλευσεν ἐπιδείξαι αὐτῷ τὸν τὴν τελευθερίαν δίκην ἡττηθέντα. Read τὴν ἐλευθερίαν δίκην. He was charged with being a 'gentleman' (at least to the extent of living a free life).

*Mor.* 223 E σοφιστοῦ δὲ τινος περὶ ἀνδρείας λέγοντος, πλείω ἐγέλασε. Read πλάττει ἐγέλασε.

*Mor.* 233 D ἐπαινούντος τινοὺς τοὺς ἀρίστους μαχητάς, Δάκων εἶπεν 'ἐν Τροίᾳ'.  
Read ἐπαινούντος τινοὺς <Ἀργείους ὡς ὄντας> ἀρίστους κ.τ.λ.

*Mor.* 234 D Σπαρτιάτης ἐρωτηθεὶς εἰ ἀσφαλὴς ἡ εἰς Σπάρτην οδὸς εἶπεν  
'ὁποῖος καθίστης' οἱ μὲν γὰρ λέοντες βαδίζοντι ὅπα κα λέωντι, τὼς δὲ λαγὼς ἐπὶ  
τῇ σκηνῇ θηρεύομεν'. Read ὁποῖός κἀ τις ἦς and ἐπὶ τῆς κηνᾶς (i.e. κενῆς).  
'That depends upon the sort of man you are; for lions walk where they  
choose, but for hares we hunt upon empty (i.e. no man's) land (i.e. you will  
only find them there, they dare not venture anywhere else).

*Mor.* 241 C A Spartan mother lost her son in battle, and when an old  
woman condoled with her, exclaiming ὦ γύναι, τῆς τύχας, she replied νὴ τῷ  
σιῷ, ἀλλὰ τῆς καλᾶς γε· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν ὦν ἔνεκεν ἔτεκεν, ἢ ὑπὲρ τῆς Σπάρτας  
ἀποθάνῃ, τοῦτό μοι συνέβη. Bernardakis should not have altered ὦν to οὔ. The  
correct form, as shown by the corruption also, is ὦ. Read also ναὶ τῷ σιῷ,  
γα, and συνέβα.

*Mor.* 335 B Λυσίππου δὲ τὸν ἰππῶτον Ἀλέξανδρον πλάσαντος, ἄνω βλέποντα  
κ.τ.λ. Bernardakis notes 'πρῶτον del. Abreschius'. A simple solution, but  
scarcely satisfactory. Read τὸν κριωτὸν Ἀλέξανδρον (i.e. Alexander 'with  
the ram's horns').

*Mor.* 616 F (Of the abolition of precedence at a banquet.) εἰ δὲ περὶ  
τᾶλλα τὴν ἰσότητά τοις ἀνδράσι φυλάξομεν, τί οὐκ ἐντεῦθεν ἀρξάμενοι πρῶτον  
ἐθίζομεν ἀτύφως καὶ ἀφελῶς κατακλίνεσθαι μετ' ἀλλήλων, εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῶν θυρῶν  
ὀρώντας, ὅτι ἰδημόκριτος ἐπὶ τὸ δείπνον καὶ οὐκ ἐξαίρετον ὡς . . . πόλιν†, ἐφ'  
οὗ κατακλιθεὶς ὁ πλούσιος ἔν τῇ κατακλίσει τοῖς εὐτελεστάτοις; This very  
corrupt passage can, I think, be emended with more certainty than most  
others. For δημόκριτος Turnebus gave δημοκρατικῶς, which, however, is less  
near than δημοτικῶς. For ἐπὶ read ἔξει (i.e. ἐξί). ἐφ' οὗ (cf. 619 B)  
shows that τόπον was in the sentence (cf. 619 E τοῦτον ἐξαίρετον ἔξει τὸν  
τόπον). For ἐν τῇ κατακλίσει (which is in any case intolerable after κατακλιθεὶς)  
read ἐγκαταχλιδήσει. Since the superlative and comparative compendia  
are constantly confused we need feel no scruple in restoring εὐτελεστέροις.  
The passage may now read εὐθὺς ἀπὸ τῶν θυρῶν ὀρώντας, ὅτι δημοτικῶς  
ἔξει τὸ δείπνον καὶ οὐκ ἐξαίρετον δῶς<ει τις> τόπον, ἐφ' οὗ κατακλιθεὶς ὁ  
πλούσιος ἐγκαταχλιδήσει τοῖς εὐτελεστέροις.

*Mor.* 645 A καὶ Ὀμηρος εἰπὼν

οὐδὲ τραπέζῃ

γνώτην ἀλλήλων

δηλὸς ἐστὶν εἰδὼς τὸ . . . . . νον τοῦ οἴνου καὶ . . . . . †πολλῶν  
γόνιμον. The first lacuna is of 12 or 13 letters, the second of 5 or 6. Read  
δηλὸς ἐστὶν εἰδὼς τὸ <παρρησιαζόμε>νον τοῦ οἴνου καὶ <λαλιῶν> ἀπλῶν  
γόνιμον.

# EMENDATIONS IN STRABO AND PLUTARCH'S MORALIA 103

*Mor.* 718 A οὐδὲν οἶσμαι δεινόν, εἰ μὴ πλησιάζων ὁ θεός, ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπος, ἀλλ' ἐτέραις τισὶν ἀφαῖς δι' ἐτέρων καὶ ψαύσεισι † τρέπει καὶ ὑποτίμπλησι θειοτέρας γονῆς τὸ θνητόν. Probably περιέπει.

*Mor.* 752 D 'Λέγω τοίνυν' ὁ Πεισίας ἔφη 'προκηρύξας ἐμοῦ γ' ἔνεκα πάσαις γυναιξὶν † ἂν ἐραστήν, ὅτι τῆς γυναικὸς ὁ πλούτος ἐστι φυλακτεὸς τῷ νεανίσκῳ. Bernardakis remarks 'quid lateat, incertum'. Surely ἀνεραστίαν, cf. ἀνεραστός *supra*. For his part Peisias makes proclamation of that attitude towards women.

*Mor.* 865 B ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τοῦ πιθανοῦ τῆς διαβολῆς ἐφρόντισεν, οὐδ' ὅπως αὐτὸς ἐαντῷ τὰναντία λέγων † παρ' ὀλίγους ἀνθρώπους οὐ φανείται συνειδώς. Read . . . τὰναντία λέγων παραλόγως ἀνοήτως . . . The corruption to παρ' ὀλίγους made that of ἀνοήτως almost inevitable.

T. G. TUCKER.

Melbourne, Nov. 1, 1907.



## NOTES ON THE PHILOSTRATI.

FOR the following notes, which are mainly on the *Life of Apollonius*, I have taken Kayser's Teubner text (1870) as the foundation, and my references are to the Olearius paging in his margin.

2 ἐπήσκητο.

There is no reason for the pluperfect. The tense should be imperfect, ἐπῆσκείτο, like those before and after.

7 (end) προῖόν δ' ἐς ἡλικίαν ἐν ᾗ γράμματα.

Some verb, e.g. ἐμάνθανε, seems missing in the relative clause.

9 Birds can be trained to say χαίρε etc. οὔτε εἰδότες ὅτι λέγουσιν οὔτε διακείμενοι πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους.

One would think that an adverb must have gone with διακείμενοι. It might be something significant, like φιλικῶς, or something slight and neutral, like πως, which would easily fall out before πρὸς.

10 ποιεῖται and ἀμπίσχεται ought, I think, to be imperfects. They have imperfects all about them, and such historical presents do not seem to occur in the text, or to be suitable.

17 αὐτόν γε μὴν τὸν χρόνον ἀγήρω τε καὶ ἀθάνατον παρὰ τῆς μνημοσύνης εἶναι. Evidently παρὰ τὴν μνημοσύνην *by reason of memory*.

*ibid.* ἂν πρὸς ἄνδρα ἴδωσιν, ἐρυθριῶσι.

Not if they see a man, that is, any man; but only if he is a *vir pietate gravis*. Some adjective is missing, or perhaps disguised in πρὸς. πρεσβύτερον?

27 πάλαι γάρ σε ἤκούομεν.

Read ἀκούομεν.

54 Some points of physical science may perhaps be studied best on mountains, but neither Athos nor Olympus will help you in moral and theological questions, εἰ μὴ διορῶν αὐτὰ ἡ ψυχὴ, ἣν εἰ καθαρὰ καὶ ἀκήρατος αὐτῶν ἀπτοῖτο πολλῶ μείζον ἔργον ἂν φαῖν ἤττειν τουτοῦ τοῦ Καυκάσου.

The general meaning must be that the mind will go further, higher, than any mountain. ἤττειν, used of rapid motion, the swiftness of thought, is no doubt right enough, though its implied application to the Caucasus rising into the air is a little strange. But ought not μείζον to be μάσσον, *further or higher*,

not *greater*  
confusion o

66 (enc

Perhap

79 (enc

ἐν for

81 π

This i  
genitive, ελ

83 (enc  
ἐνδαιμονεστ  
and has no

96 ο

104

Read

that is less

105

χισμένους

A rer  
substitutec

on by οὐδ

with the s  
and antith

ὁ Δάμις ἐλ  
have in 19

Ἴ. τετμήσε  
μᾶλλον δέ

With  
γὰρ for ἥ

110

ἐγώ, ἔφη,  
We

οὔτε ξυμ  
μένος αὐτ

πρεσβύτε

111

Ther  
in the ra

not *greater*? I have suggested a similar change in Xen. *Mem.* 4. 7. 10, and the confusion of μάλλον, μᾶλλον, and μέγιστος, μῆκιστος occurs, I think, elsewhere.

66 (end) ἔοικας . . . μεταγράφειν τὸ ἱαμβεῖον.

Perhaps μεταγράφειν.

79 (end) ἐπειδὴν ἐς τοῦ βασιλέως πίνουσιν.

ἐν for ἐς?

81 πόθεν οὕτως ἔχεις φωνῆς Ἑλλάδος;

This may be right, but it looks as though an adverb governing the genitive, e.g. ἐμπείρους, was lost.

83 (end) πλειόνων δὲ ἢ ἐγὼ ἄρχει καὶ εὐδαίμων ἢ χώρα παρὰ πολὺ τῆς ἐνταῦθα. εὐδαιμονοστέρα or εὐδαίμων <μάλλον> is required. παρὰ πολὺ is only *by much*, and has not in itself any comparative force.

96 οὔτ' <ἀν> νοσῆσαι . . . οὔτ' ἂν τρωθεῖς ἀλγῆσαι.

104 νομίζεν Ἑλληνικοῖς ἤθεσι.

Read ἔθεσι. So in 172 we ought perhaps to read ἀδικῶν περὶ τὰ ἔθη, but that is less clear.

105 εἶδον . . . αἰκούντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς καὶ οὐκ ἐπ' αὐτῆς καὶ ἀτειχίστως τετειχισμένους καὶ οὐδὲν κεκτημένους ἢ τὰ πάντων.

A remarkably clear case, though the editors strangely fail to see it, of ἢ substituted by confusion for καί. The contradictions must of course be carried on by οὐδὲν κεκτημένους καὶ τὰ πάντων. The same sentence, εἶδον κ.τ.λ. occurs with the same uncorrected blunder in 245. Yet in 106 we have the true sense and antithesis given in the phrase τὸ δὲ μὴδὲν κεκτημένους τὰ πάντων ἔχειν ὥδε ὁ Δάμις ἐξηγεῖται κ.τ.λ. Through similar corruption and want of perception we have in 194 τὸ τετμήσεσθαι τὸν Ἰσθμὸν ἢ οὐ τετμήσεσθαι, in spite of 163 τὸ τὸν Ἰ. τετμήσεσθαι καὶ οὐ τετμήσεσθαι, and of 162 οὗτος ὁ αὐχὴν τῆς γῆς τετμήσεται, μάλλον δὲ οὐ.

With these examples before us we need not hesitate much in reading καὶ γάρ for ἢ γάρ in 6.

110 τίνα θαυμασιώτερον ἡγῇ τῶν ἐπὶ Τροίαν τε καὶ ὑπὲρ Τροίας ἐλθόντων; ἐγὼ, ἔφη, Ἀχιλλεῖα.

We should read no doubt τίνα θαυμασιώτατον. In 241, on the contrary, οὔτε ξυμβούλους ὑμᾶς βίου ποιησόμενος ἤκω . . . πρεσβυτάτος τε ὑμῶν . . . ἀφιγμένος αὐτὸς ἂν μάλλον εἰκότως ξυμβούλευον ὑμῖν, it is equally clear that we need πρεσβύτερος.

111 φάσμα . . . προϊόντας αὐτοὺς ἤλανεον ἐνταραττόμενον τῷ ὁμίλῳ.

There is no meaning in ἐνταραττόμενον. ἐνταττόμενον τῷ ὁμίλῳ *appearing in the ranks*? In Plato *Laws* 797 E ταχθέντα is a variant for παραχθέντα.

*ibid.* τὸ δὲ πορθεῖν πόλεις ὅστις εὐκλείστερον ἡγεῖται τοῦ ἀνοικίζειν πόλιν οὐκ ἔστι.

It is difficult to believe that, according to the writer, no one (οὐκ ἔστιν ὅστις) thought this. It has always been the idea of the mass of men. Is some predicate to οὐκ ἔστι lost? A dozen might be suggested.

115 καὶ λαμπρύνοντες αὐτοὺς ἐπαίνους οἷσπερ τὰ ἀνδράποδα ξηλωτοὺς πέμπετε. Perhaps οἷσπερ, or <τοῖς αὐτοῖς> (lost after αὐτοῖς) ἐπαίνους οἷσπερ.

116 οὓς ἐβουλόμην ἂν μάλλον λίμνην αὐτῷ περιβλῦσαι <ποιῆσαι> νέκταρος? περιβλύω is intransitive.

118 (end) ἐπεὶ δὲ ἐς ἄνδρας ἐξαλλάττεις ἥδη (*are growing a man*), φειδώμεθα τῶν ἀνοήτων καὶ εὐκόλων.

εὐκόλων is mere nonsense in this context. Probably εὐτέλων. Menander has ἐγὼ δ' ἀνόητος εὐτέλης ὑπερβολῇ (M. 4. 266: K. 3. 185).

119 (init.) ἐμοὶ δὴ, not δέ.

140 ἐφοίτων . . . ξένον τε αὐτὸν ἡγοῦμενοι καὶ βίου ξύμβουλον βιωμῶν τε ιδρύσεις καὶ ἀγαλμάτων. By a mistake which is found elsewhere (cf. a suggestion of mine on Herod. 6. 52) ἡγοῦμενοι has been written, I should say, for ποιούμενοι. Cf. 147 ἱατρὸν ποιούμενοι αὐτὸν τοῦ πάθους: 171 ξένον τε παρὰ τῇ Διὶ ἐποιούντο . . . βίον τε νομοθέτην: 178 ἡγεμόνας αὐτοὺς ποιεῖσθαι. The word ἡγοῦμενοι is even less appropriate to καὶ . . . ἀγαλμάτων than to ξένον.

142 ἀσωτίαν καὶ τρυφήν can hardly be predicates of ἐκείνων. An infinitive to govern them is missing.

145 He said a beautiful city was like the Zeus of Phidias, καθῆσθαι γὰρ αὐτὸ (the statue)—οὕτως τῷ δημιουργῷ ἔδοξε τοὺς δὲ ἄνδρας ἐπὶ πάντα ἥκοντας μηδὲν ἀπεικίνειν τοῦ Ὀμηρείου Διός, ὅς κ.τ.λ.

The point is the fixity and immobility of the one, the freedom and movement of the other. But οὕτως . . . ἔδοξε gives poor sense, and the words are hardly grammatical, for ἔδοξε should be δόξαι. Both faults are cured together, if we add ὥς after the last letters of οὕτως and read καθῆσθαι γὰρ οὕτως <ὥς> τῷ δημιουργῷ ἔδοξε.

146 (end) ἡ περὶ αὐτοῖς (not αὐτοῖς) εὐβουλία.

148 (end) τόν τε Φοῖνικα τροφέα καὶ ὁπαδὸν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τιμῶν ἐνόμιζεν.

Kayser τιμῶν ἐνόμιζεν, which I have difficulty in translating. It is pretty clear that τιμῶν ἐνόμαζεν is what Philostratus wrote. The parts of νομίζω and ἐνομάζω are, it is well known, often confused.

163 (init.) Write δέ for τε after κομίζοντο.

169 κρινεῖσθαι, not κρίνεσθαι.

171  
Is ἐφί

189  
μοι is  
will then  
writer's o  
ξυμβαίνοι

193  
τὸν Δελφί  
μαστιγώσε  
(Cf. t  
certamine  
The  
naturally  
out, ὡς <δ  
thought o

Imme  
πότερα  
word or  
πράγματα

197  
again sub

198  
Perha  
ἐπαινοῦσι

214  
τοῦ ξην?

216

241

251  
ἀαβάλλω

274  
ὅτι μηδ

*ibid.*  
The  
the verb

287  
Read ὑπ

288

171 ναὶ τὸ σιῶ, ἔφη.

Is ἔφη for ἔφη τις (?) right?

189 δοκῶ μοι τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον ἐπεσκέφθαι τὸ ὄν.

μοι is meaningless here, and should perhaps be μέν. πιστοῦται δὲ κ.τ.λ. will then correspond to it. If, as appears to be the case, πιστοῦται is the writer's own addition (otherwise we should have πιστοῦσθαι and ἀπολείπειν), ξυμβαίνει must be read for ξυμβαίνειν.

193 Nero performing in Greece λεαίνων τὴν φωνὴν καὶ δεδιὼς τὸν Ἥλειον ἢ τὸν Δελφόν, ἢ μὴ δεδιὼς μὲν, κακῶς δὲ οὕτως ὑποκρινόμενος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ τέχνην ὡς μὴ μαστιγώσεσθαι νομίζειν πρὸς τούτων ὧν αὐτὸς ἄρχειν τέτακται.

(Cf. the picture in Suetonius *Nero* 24 *pauidus et metuens ne ob delictum certamine summo veretur*.)

The words ὡς μὴ μ. ν. seem to give the very opposite sense to what we naturally look for, 'so badly as *not* to be scourged.' Can a δσον have dropped out, ὡς <δσον> μὴ μ. ν., 'so badly as just to escape a scourging'? I have also thought of μεμαστιγώσεσθαι, but the sense would be odd.

Immediately afterwards τοῖς δὲ Ἑλλήσι τίνα (= πότερον) ἡγῶ, ὃ Μένιππε; πότερα Ξέρξης καταπιμπράντα ἢ Νέρωνα ἄδοντα; seems to lack a predicative word or phrase to go with τίνα ἡγῶ, e.g. φοβερώτερον, or πλείω παρέχειν πράγματα.

197 A word or words also lost with τρεῖς Ῥωμαῖων αὐτοκράτορες, which is again subject without predicate. So in 206 οὐ πάντες is incomplete.

198 ἔστι τι μυθολογία; Νῆ Δί', εἶπεν ὁ Μένιππος, ἦν γε οἱ ποιηταὶ ἐπαινοῦσι. Perhaps ἐπασκοῦσι. Cf. 1 above and also 3 σοφίας ἦν . . . ἐπήσκησεν. ἐπαινοῦσι is senseless.

214 ὡς ὑπὸ γυναιῶν ἡττηθεὶς ἐπελάθετο <οὐ μόνον> τοῦ ἄρχειν ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ ξῆν?

216 (end) βελτίων ἂν ἦν should be β. ἂν ἦσθα.

241 ἐν Πυθαγόρῳ. Surely Πυθαγόρα, unless anything is omitted.

251 ἐπεὶ δὲ πιθανὸς ὑμῶν ἔδοξε τοῦ μόνον διαβάλλειν ἦθος. πιθανῶς or διαβάλλων.

274 (end) 'ἐγὼ δέ . . . οὕτω ἔγνω οὐρανοῦ προγενεστέρους ἀστέρας,' διδάσκων ὅτι μηδ' ἂν γένοιτό τι τοῦ ἐν ᾧ φύεται μὴ ὄντος. Read φύσεται.

*ibid.* καθιέντος ἐς αὐτοὺς ὑποψίας, ὑφ' ὧν διειστήκεσαν ἐκκλησιαζομένη πόλις.

The last words, as they stand, are unintelligible. But the last letters of the verb suggest a remedy. Should it not run διειστήκεσαν <ὡς ἂν> ἐ. πόλις?

287 (init.) εἰδοῦσαν ὑμᾶς ὥδην Μοῦσαι μήπω ἐς δίκας ἢ διαβολὰς ὑπαχθεῖσαν. Read ὑπαχθεῖσαι.

288 ὃ μηδέ should be ὁ μηδέ.

310 αὐτοῦ τε γὰρ τοῦ σχήματος <νεκα>? ἀπεβλέπετο . . . καὶ αὐτὸ δὲ τὸ ἦκεν ὑπὲρ ἀνδρῶν κινδυνεύοντα καὶ τοὺς βασκαίνοντας αὐτῷ πρότερον ἐπιτηδεύειν ἐποίει.

ἀνδρῶν can hardly be right. Either add something to it or read ἄλλων.

In Plut. *Mor.* 603 B ἄλλον is a mistake for the Homeric ἀνδρῶν.

323 Σωκράτην . . . ὅτε ἔφυγε τὴν γραφὴν. Read ἔφευγε. ἔφυγε would mean *was acquitted*. So in *Heroicus* 660 read γραφὴν ἐκεῖ ἂν τις, οἶμαι, φεύγοι (not φεύγοι) μὴ τρυφῶν.

324 ἥδη μέτρει, βασιλεῦ, ὕδωρ· εἰ γὰρ ξυγχωρήσεις αὐτῷ μήκος λόγων, ἀπάγξει ἡμᾶς.

Cobet θέλξει for ἀπάγξει, but the words are very unlike. By the omission of one letter we can get ἀπάξει, which seems suitable enough: e.g. cf. Dem. 19. 242 εἰν ἡμᾶς ἀπαγάγη τῷ λόγῳ and τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀπαγαγὼν ἀπὸ τῆς ὑποθέσεως. In Plut. *Demetr.* 5 πορθεῖν Συρίαν καὶ τὰς πόλεις ἀπάγειν καὶ βιάζεσθαι. Madvig's ἀπάγχειν may be right.

328 ὡς μὴ τὸ εὐθὺ ἐχούσης. Rather ἐξούσης.

359 (end) ἀκροάσασθαι should be ἀκροάσεσθαι. So too 312 (end).

I add a very few notes on the other writings.

#### LIVES OF SOPHISTS.

479 πατέρας δὲ οὐ προσέγραψα, μὰ Δί', οὐ πᾶσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀπ' εὐδοκίμων. Punctuate μὰ Δί' οὐ, πᾶσιν. Otherwise οὐ could not well be repeated.

*ibid.* οἶδα γὰρ δὴ καὶ Κριτίαν τὸν σοφιστὴν οὐκ ἐκ πατέρων <ἀρξάμενον>, ἀλλ' Ὀμήρου δὴ μόνον σὺν τῇ πατρὶ ἐπιμνησθέντα?

500 καὶ οἱ τίραννοι δὲ αἰρετώτεροι τοῖς ἀρχομένοις ἀνιέμενοι μᾶλλον ἢ ξυντείνοντες· εἰ γὰρ ἀνήσουσιν, ἦττον μὲν ἀποκτενοῦσιν, ἦττον δὲ δράσονται τε καὶ ἀρπάσσονται.

δράσονται is a *vox nihili*. Perhaps it represents διασπάσσονται, ρ and ι being exchanged, as often, and the repetition of σσ leading to loss. But I am not quite sure that διασπᾶν gives a good meaning here, for its sense is not *plunder* but *rend in pieces, divide*, etc. If we could run the two futures into one and read διαρπάσσονται, we should get a quite appropriate word.

ἀνιέμενοι ought, I think, to be ἀνιέμενοι, matching ξυντείνοντες. The two forms are often confused. Thus in Clem. Alex. *Paedagog.* 3. 11. 74 it should be ἀνιέμενα (not ἀνιέμενα) τὰ τοῦ σώματος μέλη, to match the perfects καθεμμένη etc. preceding.

576 (end) Ἐλλησπόντῳ γῆν ὀλίγην ἐπιβαλὼν ταύτην οἶε σοι μένειν. Obviously μενεῖν.

580 (init.) ἀξιούonta κατηγορεῖν τοῦ μὲν Δημοσθένους Μηδισμοῦ, τοῦ δὲ Αἰσχίνου Φιλιππισμοῦ.

Read Μηδισμόν . . . Φιλιππισμόν. So in *Letter* 40 κατηγορεῖ δὲ καὶ γῆρας τοῦ προσώπου.

603  
Ἐλευσίνι.

Before  
510 λόγου  
we have

605  
Read

πέπασαι  
This  
No error

662  
καὶ μ. δ.

682 (end)  
τοῦ ἑκτο  
αὐτὰ μὴδ'

εἰ μὴ  
very fast  
It would

<πλὴν> εἰ

It is  
another  
words qu

some earl

705 (end)  
παίζοντας  
perhaps h  
been inte  
suppose a  
. . . οἶοι

722  
φαίνει.  
(D. Hal.

726  
oftener th  
has ὅμως

In th  
of p. 364  
στενὴ οὐσ

603 ἐκτῆσατο δὲ καὶ οἰκίας, δύο μὲν ἐν ἄσπει, μίαν δὲ ἐν Πειραιεὶ καὶ ἄλλην Ἐλευσίνι.

Before the δ of δύο I suspect another δ = τέτταρας has been lost. So in 510 λόγοι δ' Αἰσχίνου κατ' ἐνίου μὲν καὶ τέταρτος it has been pointed out that we have to add a γ = τρεῖς (λόγοι δ' Αἰσχίνου γ' κατ' ἐνίου μὲν καὶ τέταρτος).

605 μὴ ἀπειναι τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῖς θεραπεύοντας.

Read θεραπεύοντας, comparing 703 ἔρμον τῶν θεραπευσόντων, 716 ὅτι μὴ πέτασαι τὸν θεραπεύοντα, etc. The future is regular.

This makes the fifth correction of present to future in these few notes. No error is commoner.

## HEROICVS.

662 Add ἄν to καὶ κάρνα δοῖν καὶ μῆλα δοῖν. Possibly καὶ κάρνα δ' ἄν καὶ μ. δ., for the repetition of δοῖν seems to lack point.

682 (end) περὶ μὲν γάρ τοῦ Παρίδος οὐδ' ἀκούειν ἀξιώ οὐδέν . . . , περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ἑκτορος . . . οὐκ ἂν ἐροίμην γέ τι οὐδ' ἂν ἀκούσαιμι χαίρων, εἰ μὴ διαπηδῶς αὐτὰ μῆδ' ἀμελῶς λέγοις.

εἰ μὴ κ.τ.λ. is quite absurd. 'I should not care to listen, unless you went very fast and carelessly.' Of course we want the opposite, not *unless* but *if*. It would be awkward to double the μὴ (εἰ μὴ <μὴ> διαπηδῶς), and therefore <πλὴν> εἰ μὴ seems not unlikely, or εἰ μὴ <μήτε> . . . μήτε . . .

It is not a bad instance of the carelessness with which editors follow one another that both Kayser (1870) and Westermann (Didot 1878) give these words quite erroneously as a question. The mistake was probably made in some earlier text, which they reproduce.

705 (end) δίδωσιν ὑμῖν ξυμμάχους ἑκατὸν πόλεις καὶ ὥς τὴν Τροίαν ελεῖν παίζοντας. καί is unmeaning. It is sometimes confused with ὥς, and has perhaps here been repeated from it by accident: that is, one compendium has been interpreted twice over, once as καί and again as ὥς. The alternative is to suppose an omission, e.g. καὶ <τοιούτους> ὥς. Cf. a little below: τοιοῦτοί ἐσμεν . . . οἷοι Τροίαν μὲν ἐσπουδακότες λαβεῖν, Κρήτην δὲ παίζοντες.

722 τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ ἐν Ἰλίφ νέον τὸν Ἑκτορα καὶ μεираκιώδη φέρει. Probably φαίνει. *Sexcenties in φέρειν et φαίνειν scribæ turbant et titubant*, says Cobet (D. Hal. p. 112).

726 δεθῆναι δ' αὖ should probably be δεθῆναι δ' ἄν, though the mistake is oftener the other way, ἄν for αὖ. But cf. for instance Thuc. 6. 91. 2, where M has ὅμως δ' αὖ for ὅμως δ' ἄν.

In the remarks on epistolary style appended to the letters read at end of p. 364 ἵνα τοῦτ' γοῦν ἡ βραχυλογία ὠραῖζοιτο ἐς ἄλλην ἢ πᾶσαν (for πᾶσα) στενὴ οὐσα.

H. RICHARDS.

# AD MARCVM ANTONINVM.

*M. Antoninus Imperator ad se ipsum recogn.* I. H. LEOPOLD, Oxonii (Scriptorum Classicorum bibliotheca Oxoniensis).

B, ιε'. "Οτι πάν ὑπόληψις.

Fieri potest ut ita scripserit Marcus, suspiceris tamen πάνθ'. Cf. IB, η' (=IB, κβ'): "Οτι πάντα ὑπόληψις, IB, κς': ὅτι πάνθ' ὑπόληψις.

B, ις'. Ὑβρίζει ἐαυτὴν ἢ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ψυχὴ μάλιστα μὲν, ὅταν ἀπόστημα— γίνηται· ἔπειτα δέ, ὅταν ἀνθρώπῳ τινα ἀποστραφῇ ἢ καὶ ἐναντία φέρεται—. τρίτον ὑβρίζει ἐαυτὴν, ὅταν ἡσᾶται ἡδονῆς ἢ πόνου. τέταρτον, ὅταν ὑποκρίνηται καὶ ἐπιπλάσῃως καὶ ἀναλήθως τι ποιῇ ἢ λέγῃ. πέμπτον, ὅταν πράξῃ τινα ἐαυτῆς καὶ ὁρμὴν ἐπ' οὐδένα σκοπὸν ἀφίῃ, ἀλλ' εἰκῇ καὶ ἀπαρακολουθήτως ὅτιοῦν ἐνεργῇ κτέ.

Vix dubium est quin scribendum sit γίνηται et ἀποστρέφῃ.

Z, ιζ'. Εὐδαιμονία ἐστὶ δαίμων ἀγαθὸς ἢ <ἡγεμονικόν> ἀγαθόν.

Lacunam manifestam haud inepte suppleuit Gataker, malim tamen ut in commentariis tam aliorum philosophorum quam Heracliti memoria plenissimis δαίμων ἀγαθὸς ἢ <ἦθος> ἀγαθόν. Cf. Heracl. fragm. 119 (Diels *Vorsokratiker* i<sup>2</sup> p. 78): ἦθος ἀνθρώπῳ δαίμων.

I, ιβ'. Τίς ὑπονοίας χρεῖα παρὸν σκοπεῖν τί δεῖ πραχθῆναι, κἂν μὲν σύνορᾳς, εὐμένως, ἀμεταστρέπτῃ ταύτῃ χωρεῖν· εἰ δὲ μὴ σύνορᾳς, ἐπέχειν καὶ συμβούλοις τοῖς ἀρίστοις χρῆσθαι· εἰ δὲ ἕτερα ἢ τινα πρὸς ταῦτα ἀντιβαίνειν, προιέναι κατὰ τὰς παρούσας ἀφορμὰς λελογισμένως, ἐχόμενον τοῦ φαινομένου δικαίου; ἄριστον γὰρ κατατυγχάνειν τούτου, ἐπεὶ τοι ἢ γε ἀπόπτωσις ἀπὸ τούτου ἐστίν.

Verba ἄριστον—τούτου recte interpretatus esse uidetur Gataker 'hoc enim assequi, ut iuste agas, optimum est', quae sequuntur ἐπεὶ τοι ἢ γε ἀπόπτωσις ἀπὸ τούτου ἐστίν (sic Boot pro ἔστω, cf. B, γ': δόγματα ἔστω Richards pro ἐστίν) sensu cassa sunt, qui tamen restitui mihi uidetur si legimus ἀπροπτωσία i.e. absentia temeritatis in adnuendo (ἐν συγκαταθέσει) et consequenter in agendo, quae uirtus ab iustitia est (ἀπὸ τούτου), cf. IA, ι': ἀπὸ δὲ ταύτης (τῆς δικαιοσύνης) αἱ λοιπαὶ ἀρεταὶ ὑφίστανται· οὐ γὰρ τηρηθήσεται τὸ δίκαιον, εἰ ἢ τοι διαφερόμεθα πρὸς τὰ μέσα ἢ εὐεξαπάτητοι καὶ προπτωτικοὶ καὶ μεταπτωτικοὶ ὤμεν, neque aliunde paratur sed posita est in τῇ φύσει καὶ τῇ τοῦ λογικοῦ ξύφου κατασκευῇ, αὕτη δὲ ἐπαγγέλλεται ἀπροπτωσίαν (I, θ'), cf. Z, ιε': ἐν τῇ λογικῇ κατασκευῇ τὸ ἀπρόπτωτον. Itaque si habes in te ipso quo omnem scrupulum ex animo euellas, τίς ὑπονοίας χρεῖα; ubi ὑπονοίαν bene uertit Jackson 'timidity and suspicion'.

Rotterdam.

A. I. KRONENBERG.



NOTES ON PLATO *LAWS* I.-VI.

IN reading the last six books of Plato's *Laws* in Prof. Burnet's excellent edition I notice some passages the corruptions in which seem to me to be due to that very common fault of copyists, false change of case usually due to the preceding word or words.

791 c ἐν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς ψυχῆς μόριον ἀρετῆς should be ἐν δὲ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς ψυχῆς μόριον ἀρετὴν (cf. 807 c, where Ast's ἀρετὴν is certainly a right correction).

802 d τό γε τῆς ἡδονῆς ἢ ἀθλίας περὶ ἐκατέρας οὐδὲν πεπλεονέκτηκεν should, I think, be τό γε τῆς ἡδονῆς ἢ ἀθλίας πέρι ἐκατέρα οὐδὲν πεπλ.

814 a I should correct this εἰ μηδενὸς ἔνεκα, ἀλλ' εἴ ποτε δεήσει πανδημεὶ πάσῃ τῇ δυνάμει καταλείποντας τὴν πόλιν ἔξω στρατεύεσθαι τοὺς φυλάξαντας παῖδας τε καὶ τὴν ἄλλην πόλιν, ἱκανὰς εἶναι τό γε τοσοῦτον.

The women are to be trained in arms if for no other reason for this, that in the event of the whole male population, who while in the city guarded their children and all else, being compelled to take the field, the women may be good for so much at least, i.e. for garrisoning the city. ἱκανὰς has been falsely attracted into the case of τοὺς φυλάξαντας.

815 a The whole sentence as far as μμείσθαι refers to the pyrrhic dance, and I think we should restore ἐπιχειροῦσαν μμείσθαι. A false semblance of grammar has been produced by changing ἐπιχειροῦσαν to the case of τὰς ταύταις ἐναντίας. What is ταύταις? It is ταῖς εὐλαβείαις. What are the things which are αἱ ἐναντίαι to the εὐλάβειαι?—certainly not ὀρχήσεις, as we must understand if we retain ἐπιχειρούσας, and of course not εὐλάβειαι, as in strictness we should understand if we write ἐπιχειροῦσαν. I think the word to be mentally supplied from what precedes is κινήσεις.

942 d καὶ δὲ καὶ χορείας πάσας εἰς τὰς ἀριστείας τὰς κατὰ πόλεμον βλέποντας χορεύειν. βλέποντας was wrongly attracted to the case of χορείας.

960 c 7 sq. I suggest as a restoration of this passage τὸ Δάχεσιν μὲν τὴν πρώτην εἶναι, Κλωθὴ δὲ τὴν δευτέραν, τὴν Ἀτροπον δὲ τρίτην σώτειραν τῶν ληχθέντων (with Bekker) ἀπρασμένα πη τῶν κλωσθέντων τῇ πῆναι τὴν ἀμετάστροφον ἀπεργαζομένην δύναμιν. The change of ἀπεργαζομένην to the acc. sing. seems quite necessary, as it is Atropos who makes her sisters'

Cf. IB, η'

ἀπόστημα—  
ται.— τρίτον  
οκρίνηται καὶ  
να εἰναι καὶ  
ἐνεργῇ κτέ.

tamen ut in  
a plenissimis  
Vorsokratiker

μὲν συνορῶς,  
μυβούλοις τοῖς  
καὶ κατὰ τὰς  
ἀριστον γὰρ

r 'hoc enim  
όπτωσις ἀπὸ  
s pro ἐστιν)  
όπτωσία i.e.  
in agendo,  
δικαιοσύνης)  
διαφερώμεθα  
όμεν, neque  
κατασκευῇ,  
ατασκευῇ τὸ  
ex animo  
midity and

NENBERG.

work ἀμετάστροφον. The word was falsely attracted to the case of τῶν λεχθέντων. Atropos makes the λεχθέντα similar in a way to the reel or spool on which the spun thread is wound as regards their virtue of irreversibility. The πῆνος is irreversible in this sense that to get the thread off it you can only turn it in one direction.

967 d 1 τοὺς φιλοσοφούντας κυσὶ ματαίαις ἀπεικάζοντας χρωμέναισιν ὕλακαῖς. Surely philosophers were never compared to dogs of this sex, and we should restore the masculine gender changed by a copyist who understood ματαίαις to go with κυσὶ.

In all these instances there is an obvious motive which may have prompted a copyist to change the case of a word, and the justification of the corrections I propose lies in this. Owing to the great grammatical freedom of the style I would never propose to change a case where no such motive can be discerned.

I add a few suggestions about other passages.

802 d 1 ἀκούων ἀεὶ τῆς ἐναντίας?

828 c 7 καὶ τί τῶν τούτων?

836 a 4/5 ἡ τῶν ἀρχόντων ὄψις διηναγκασμένη μὴ ἀποβλέπειν ἄλλοσε, τηρεῖν δ' αἰεὶ τοὺς νέους πάντως. The MS. text τοὺς νέους τ' αὐτοὺς is certainly corrupt. The change I suggest is not very violent. πάντως would mean 'at any cost.'

841 b 2 sq. τὸ δὲ λαθάνειν τούτων ὁρῶντά τι καλὸν παρ' αὐτοῖς ἔστω . . . , τὸ δὲ μὴ λαθάνειν αἰσχρὸν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ μὴ πάντως ὁρᾶν.

'It is to be regarded as good to do such things without being found out, but to be found out is to be regarded as a disgrace,' but then I cannot understand ἀλλ' οὐ τὸ μὴ πάντως ὁρᾶν, which can only mean, 'but not to do it at all is not to be regarded as a disgrace.' There has been no suggestion at all that continence could be regarded as disgraceful. Should we substitute φανερώς for πάντως?

848 a 5 The reading of A ὅσαι χρεῖαι seems to me better. τινί refers to the producer and vendor.

849 b 8 We should write τρίτη δὲ εἰκάδι τῶν ζώων ἔστω πρᾶσις.

855 a 8 ἀν ἧ τί τ' ἐφ' τοῦ κλήρου κατεσκευασμένου περισσεύον. 'If anyone has anything over after his property has been cultivated.'

887 d 7 It will be found that this very long clause reads much better if we insert τε after σπουδῇ. It may easily have fallen out before τῇ. The same remedy may be applied 921 e 1, inserting τε before τιμάς.

934 a  
870 c 8 οἱ  
from fear  
have used

935 d  
when it is  
chaff of t

936 c  
man's sla  
means the

947 d  
This

from som  
πίνοντες  
ναλισκόντ  
bad conje  
these pas  
πυρίων.  
well-know  
Burnet o  
known to

954 c

964 a  
fairly dis  
wrote ἡ  
taken to  
rate is qu

NO. X.

934a 4 AO have ἐν φόβοις δεινῶς. We should restore δειλοῖς. Cf. 870c 8 οἱ δειλοὶ καὶ ἄδικοι φόβοι. He distinguishes fear which is cowardly from fear which is not. I don't think ἐν φόβοις δειλίας is a phrase he would have used, and it is ill supported.

935d 2 For λαιδοροῦμεν read λαιδορον μὲν. 'And this (ridicule) is λαιδορον, when it is uttered in anger.' He then goes on with τί δ' ἐ δὴ; to discuss the chaff of the comic poets which is not angry and not λαιδορον.

936c 8 Plato is obviously speaking of one man's slave injuring another man's slave; so we must write τὸν ἀλλότριον for τῶν ἀλλοτρίων. καὶ ἐτιοῦν means then, of course, 'in any way at all.'

947d 7 λίθων ποτίμων.

This reading is of high antiquity. Photius and Suidas, quoting doubtless from some lexicon to Plato, try to explain it thus: μήποτε τῶν πάρων λέγει, οἱ πίνοντες τὸ ὕδωρ ἰσχυρότεροι γίνονται, ἢ τῶν τὴν σάρκα τῶν ἐντιθεμένων καταναλισκόντων σωμάτων, while Pollux (ix. 49) and Suidas (s.v. ψαλίδα) have the bad conjecture πολυτίμων, based of course on ποτίμων. Before I was aware of these passages in the lexicographers, I had conjectured that Plato wrote λίθων πωρίνων. Prof. von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff considers it unlikely that such a well-known word as πωρίνων should have been corrupted to ποτίμων. Prof. Burnet on the contrary is inclined to agree with me. There is no instance known to me of πότιμος or βρώσιμος bearing an active sense, διδάσκει or edax.

954c 3 L has χρόνου δέ, and perhaps we should read χρόνου ὅδε.

964a 8 ἢ τὸν γε ὄντα τι. As my other suggestions have been, I trust, fairly discreet, I venture to offer a most audacious one to close with. Plato wrote ἢ τὸν γ' ἐπαϊόντά τι. This became ἢ τὸν γε, παῖ, ὄντα τι, and παῖ, taken to be the vocative of παῖς, was expelled as a horror. ἐπαῖοντα at any rate is quite the proper word here.

W. R. PATON.

ON AN INSCRIPTION TO MARS FOUND AT  
CAERWENT IN 1904.

THE inscribed stone, of which an illustration is here given, was found in a wall composed of large blocks, which had all formed part of some other construction. This wall, which had certainly formed no part of the original building, separated the eastern portion of House XI into two rooms numbered 5 and 6 in our plan. The text of the inscription as given by Dr. Ashby in the report published in *Archaeologia*<sup>1</sup> is as follows:

deo MARTI·LEN<sup>O</sup>  
SIVE OCEL<sup>O</sup>·VELLAVN··NIMA/<sup>G</sup>  
M·NONIVS·ROMANVS·OB  
IMMVNITAT·COLLIGN  
D D S D  
GLABRIONE·ET H<sup>O</sup>·MVLO·C<sup>O</sup>S·X·KSEPT

[Deo] Marti Leno [si]ve Ocelo Vellaun(o?) et num(ini) Aug(usti) M(arcus) Nonius Romanus ob immunitat(em) collign(i) d(onum) d(e) s(uo) d(edit) Glabrione et Homulo co(n) s(ulibus) (ante diem) x k(alendas) Sep(embres) [23 August, A.D. 152].

On the interpretation of this inscription, Dr. Ashby wrote (for his references, see *Archaeologia*):

'Lenus is a not uncommon name of Mars in Rhenish inscriptions, while Ocelus has been only found once, on an inscription from Carlisle. It is possible that the dedicator came from the Rhine, and that Ocelus is the British equivalent for Lenus. Vellaun(o) is a new epithet, but the meaning cannot be doubtful, the root being that of *duellum*, two or zwei, and recurring in the name of the Catuvellauni. The words *ob immunitatem collign*. give us more difficulty. The *immunitas* referred to is probably admission without payment of the monthly contribution or of the entrance fee usually exacted from members of a *collegium*; while *collign(ium)* must, probably, be recognised as a by-form of *collegium*: cf. *C.I.L.* vii. 1069, 1070, where the interpretation *col(umnam) lign(eam)* is difficult to accept, and is indeed rejected by Hirschfeld in commenting on *C.I.L.* xii. 22, where *collign(ium)* again occurs. If not, we must interpret *col(legi) lign(ariorum)*, though there is no trace of a stop between the two l's. The reference would then be to a guild of timber merchants. An interesting point is this, that beside the feet of Mars are those of a water bird. This may be either a goose or a swan.'

<sup>1</sup>See Vol. 59, p. 293.

AT

as found in  
other con-  
the original  
s numbered  
. Ashby in

) *M(arcus)*  
*Glabrione et*  
t, A.D. 152].

r his refer-

while Ocelus  
ble that the  
t for Lenus.  
t being that  
The words  
is probably  
fee usually  
e recognised  
*col(umnam)*  
nmenting on  
oret *col(legi)*  
ne reference  
that beside  
a swan.'



BASE OF A STATUE OF MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT IN 1904.

To face page 114.

ON

The  
here be  
interest t  
not be ou

(i) In

it is possi

In V

dedication

there are

or *Marti*

*conuivio* v

to Mars

At C

Marcus A

Add

appears t

cance to

already a

legion, as

refer to t

(ii) I

*riorum*)

inscription

two<sup>8</sup> ele

support t

The

at Vence

(iii)

these two

It m

maintains

but the e

refers, is

The

*Deo*

*Num*

*Num*

Here Hu

and *collig*

<sup>1</sup> *C.I.L.* v

<sup>2</sup> Walzing

*mains*, l. 10

<sup>3</sup> *C.I.L.* x

# ON AN INSCRIPTION TO MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT 115

The identity of the waterbird is discussed in a footnote which need not here be reproduced, but there are other points in this inscription of such interest that a somewhat fuller discussion than was possible in our report may not be out of place.

(i) In the first place if we accept the reading *collign(i)* as a by-form of *collegii*, it is possible that the *collegium* was that of the veterans of the Second Legion.

In Waltzing's list of colleges of veterans there are no instances of dedications to Mars, the only dedications to gods being to Jupiter, of which there are four,<sup>1</sup> but colleges of veterans sometimes bore the name of *Martenses*, or *Martiales*, or *Martis Cultores*.<sup>2</sup> In an inscription at Ravenna we have the *convibio ueteranorum sine Martensium*,<sup>3</sup> and we have at Augsburg a dedication to Mars and Victory by the *contubernium Marti(s) Cu(ltorum)*.<sup>4</sup>

At Caerleon, the station of the Second Legion, we have an inscription<sup>5</sup> to Marcus Aurelius by the *vete[rani] et ho[norati] leg(ionis) II. A[ug(ustae)]*.

Additional weight is given to this suggestion by the fact that this legion appears to have been recruited from the Rhine (this would give fresh significance to the identification of Mars and Lenus), and by the fact that we have already at Caerwent a fragment<sup>6</sup> of stone which possibly bears the name of the legion, as well as of a tile<sup>7</sup> on which the letters *AVG* seem undoubtedly to refer to this legion.

(ii) Dr. Ashby's suggestion that *collign* might represent *col(legi) lign(a)riorum* appears to be highly improbable in view of the fact that the only inscriptions quoted by Waltzing in which this gild is mentioned appear to be two<sup>8</sup> election inscriptions at Pompeii, in which the *lignarii* recommend or support their candidates.

The interpretation of *collign(ium) inuenum* | *Nemesiorum* in the inscription at Vence<sup>9</sup> as *collegium lignariorum* is not, I believe, accepted by any one.

(iii) But thirdly, it may perhaps be permitted to suggest that neither of these two interpretations is the right one.

It may be admitted that the inscription just quoted proves, as Hirschfeld maintains, the existence of this by-form *collignium* for *collegium* on the continent, but the evidence afforded by the two inscriptions at Birrens, to which Hirschfeld refers, is by no means so certain.

The text of these two inscriptions is as follows:

*Deo Mercurio rio Iul. Cres | cens sigill | collign' cult | ores eius · d · s · d · | u · s · l · m.*<sup>10</sup>

*Num · Aug | deo · Merc | sign · posu | erunt · cultores · colligni · eius | dem dei · cur | Ing · Rufo | u · s · l · m.*<sup>11</sup>

Here Huebner follows Mommsen in interpreting *collign* as *col(umnam) lign(eam)* and *colligni* as *col(umnae) ligni(ae)*.

<sup>1</sup> *C.I.L.* v. 784, 2475; viii. 2618, 2626.

<sup>2</sup> Waltzing, *Corporations Professionnelles chez les Romains*, I. 199.

<sup>3</sup> *C.I.L.* xl. 136.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.* iii. 5790.

<sup>5</sup> *Id.* vii. 105.

<sup>6</sup> *Arch.* 57, p. 310.

<sup>7</sup> *Id.* 60, p. 124.

<sup>8</sup> *C.I.L.* iv. 951 and 960.

<sup>9</sup> *Id.* xii. 22.

<sup>10</sup> *Id.* vii. 1069.

<sup>11</sup> *Id.* vii. 1070.



In the first inscription, as I learn from a squeeze kindly sent me by Dr. Macdonald, there is not, as is given in the Corpus, a space between the two l's of *collign*.

This would support Hirschfeld's view, but on the other hand the 'wooden column' presents no real difficulty, and fits in not inaptly with the word '*sigillum*' and the rude country in which the inscription was found. Other instances of votive columns have been found at Makter in Africa, where the column bears a bas relief of Bacchus, and the inscription reads *Liberi Aug(usto) sac(rum). | In columna corpo(ris) . . . Liberum fundente(m) vinu(m) . . . fecit*;<sup>1</sup> in Cisalpine Gaul ( . . . *columnasque mag(isterio) fi | li [sui et s]uo Meneruae d(onum) d(at)*;<sup>2</sup> in Rome (*tabula(m) marmorea(m) cum proscaenio et columnis d(ono) d(edit)*).<sup>3</sup> It is conceivable that the columns mentioned in the last may have a purely architectural significance, but in the *aram [cu]m (?) colu[mn]is et | cultu . . . dis | d. d.* also found at Rome,<sup>4</sup> the columns would seem to be votive in character. These columns enumerated above would be of marble or stone—but the substitution of wood for stone in Britain creates no difficulty.

In view then of the uncertainty of assuming that our inscription reproduces this by-form *collignium*, may it not be permitted to suggest that the letters stand for *colleg(ium) N(autarum)*? The letter before the G is almost certainly E, as the middle bar is visible even in the photograph, and the close resemblance of the letter to the E of SEPT is obvious, but the reading of I will not of course affect this suggestion.

Against this suggestion it may be urged firstly that there is no stop or space between the two l's, while they are used otherwise throughout the inscription, and not somewhat casually as (*eg.*) in xii. 1069 quoted above. But it will be observed that the mason has misjudged the space necessary for this line and the fact that he has left a space before the beginning of it has not allowed him to complete it symmetrically without leaving over an odd word or odd letters. Indeed he has only just been able to squeeze in the last letters at all, as is shown by the fact that the letter N is nearer to the moulding than the last letter of any other line.

The omission of the stop or of a space may therefore be considered as not of great importance and the interpretation may be discussed on its own merits. It is true of course that we have not as yet any mention of such a gild in Britain, our list of known gilds in this country including besides those of a religious character and that of the veterans' at Caerleon, only two trade gilds—that of the *fabri* at Chichester and the *fabricenses* at Bath (the latter of course being connected with a legion). But this objection will have no weight if the inherent probability of the interpretation can be established. In favour of it, it may be urged that numerous corporations of boatmen existed on all the chief waterways of the empire.

<sup>1</sup>Waltzing, vol. iii. No. 1396.

<sup>2</sup>C.I.L. v. 703.

<sup>3</sup>Jb. vi. 406.

<sup>4</sup>Waltzing, vol. iii. No. 1318.

We b  
Loire, the  
the Mosell  
Maros in  
Guadalquiv  
and 161-1  
of the Tib  
complete l  
various na  
going ship  
distinction  
stand for  
V(eronensi  
porations  
also for th  
made bel  
Caerwent  
this city.  
Itinerary,  
Bath to  
followed b  
Severn wa  
Caerwent,  
river. WH  
the fact r  
Severn.

ferry and  
their head  
There  
Caldicot  
ance, and  
between t  
case, have

The  
this view,  
dedication  
those of v  
*negotiantes*  
are uncert

There  
*negotiantes*

<sup>1</sup>C.I.L. ii.

<sup>2</sup>Jb. v. 401.

<sup>3</sup>Proc. of C

# ON AN INSCRIPTION TO MARS FOUND AT CAERWENT 117

We have them in Gaul, on the Seine in the time of Tiberius, and on the Loire, the Rhone and the Arar. We have them on the Rhine, the Neckar, and the Moselle; in Switzerland on the Aar, the Durance, and the Isère; on the Maros in Dacia; on the Save and the lower Danube; in Spain at Seville on the Guadalquivir, where three different inscriptions are dated respectively A.D. 146, 145, and 161-169;<sup>1</sup> on the Italian lakes as well as on the Adriatic and the mouth of the Tiber. Space will not permit of references to all these corporations, but complete lists are given in Waltzing, vol. iv. These boatmen were known by various names, *nautae*, *lyntrarii*, *scapharii*, etc., while those who manned sea-going ships appear to have been more often styled *naucularii*, though the distinction is not always maintained. The N in our inscription would therefore stand for *Nautarum*, as in the inscriptions at Verona (*coll(egio) N(autarum)* | *V(eronensium) A(rilitae) consist(entium)*;<sup>2</sup> at Nîmes and elsewhere. These corporations were of great importance, not only for the supply of the capital, but also for the public service of the provinces. Reference to this will be again made below, but here it is necessary to state clearly that the position of Caerwent amply justifies and explains the existence of such a corporation in this city. It is the second station on the XIVth Iter of the so-called Antonine Itinerary, the road, which starting from *Isca Legionum* (Caerleon) led through Bath to Calleva. The third station is Abona. I have discussed the line followed by this route elsewhere,<sup>3</sup> and tried to show that the crossing of the Severn was worked from the mouth of Caldicot Pill, some two miles below Caerwent, to the mouth of the Avon, i.e. to the junction of the Trim with this river. Whether this view, which has met with some acceptance, be right or not, the fact remains that Caerwent is the last station on the Welsh side of the Severn. It is therefore obviously the place which must have controlled the ferry and precisely the spot where a corporation of boatmen would have had their headquarters.

There is also a considerable amount of evidence<sup>4</sup> to show that either Caldicot Pill or St. Pierre Pill was in ancient times a harbour of some importance, and it seems reasonable to infer that there was communication and traffic between this harbour and Glevum higher up the Severn. There would, in this case, have been ample work for a corporation of boatmen.

The dedication to Mars may present some difficulty in the acceptance of this view, but as a matter of fact there are in Waltzing's lists only ten dedications<sup>5</sup> to this god. Of these two are by guilds of soldiers, three are by those of veterans, two are by members of trades guilds, the *dendrophori*, and the *negotiantes*, one is by a guild of slaves and freedmen, and in two the dedicators are uncertain.

There was a close contact between the corporations of *negotiatores* or *negotiantes* and those of the sailors, and though they formed quite distinct

<sup>1</sup> C.I.L. ii. 1168, 1169, 1180.

<sup>2</sup> *ib.* v. 4017.

<sup>3</sup> *Proc. of Clifton Antiq. Club*, vol. i. p. 58.

<sup>4</sup> See 'The Ancient Harbours of Gwent Iscoed,' by J. G. Wood, *Trans. Woolhope Naturalists' Field Club*, 1904, p. 191.

bodies they were constantly associated with each other, especially as regards the immunities which they enjoyed. At Delos we find τὸ κοινὸν Βηρυτίων Ποσειδωνιαστῶν τῶν | ἐμπορίων καὶ ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐγδοκείων (warehousemen) erecting a statue of the goddess Rome:<sup>1</sup> and the ἔμποροι and ναύκληροι (*negotiantes* and *naicularii*) are again associated with each other in the letter written by certain Tyrians at Puteoli to the Senate at Tyre with regard to the maintenance of a *statio*.<sup>2</sup>

The dedication of the *negotiantes* referred to above is to Jupiter, Juno and Neptune as well as to Mars, so that even assuming a close connection between the gilds, it throws no great light on the question.

It would be interesting to know to what deities the corporations of boatmen and sailors were in the habit of making their dedications, but a somewhat careful search has only resulted in the discovery of the following: at Marbach *Gen(io) nau(arum)*;<sup>3</sup> at Mantua to Hercules;<sup>4</sup> at Ettlingen to Neptune;<sup>5</sup> at Delos to *Roma*<sup>6</sup> (see *supra*); at Lyons we have a base and no indication of the statue;<sup>7</sup> and at Paris to Jupiter.<sup>8</sup> The dedications at Ettlingen and Paris are of some interest, because in the former case the statue of Neptune is accompanied by a marine monster as well as by a dolphin, and it might be interesting to compare this with our waterbird, and in the latter case the Latin inscription (*Tib(erio) Caesare | Aug(usto) Joui optumo | Maxsumo (aram) | nautae Parisiad[i] | publice posierus[et]*) is accompanied by Celtic words, and there are also representations of what are presumably Celtic gods as well as what appears to be an identification of these with Roman gods. The four altars on which these are found are well illustrated in Desjardins, *Geog. de la Gaule Romaine*, vol. iii, pp. 261 sqq., and are discussed at length by Hirschfeld in the *Corpus*, and by Mowat, *Bull. Epigr. de la Gaule*, vol. i. (1881), pp. 49 sqq. Mowat's illustrations are less good.

The evidence afforded by this most interesting monument is not of course of great weight. Identifications of local and Roman gods were no doubt often made by soldiers as well as by sailors, but in any case it is an interesting parallel to our inscription and its identification of Lenus, Ocelus, and Mars.

On the whole then it may be said that the evidence afforded by the dedication tends somewhat to support Dr. Ashby's interpretation and my own first suggestion that if we read *colligni* the corporation is one of veterans, but it cannot be said that it precludes the other suggestion that we have here a *collegium nautarum*.

(iv) Dr. Ashby's interpretation of *immunitas* is of course possible. *Immunes* on several occasions showed their gratitude for their immunity by gifts to their college. For instance Cinnamus, a slave of the imperial house, makes a gift *collegio Liberi Patris et Mercuri | negotiantium cellarum uinariarum . . . ob immunitat(em)* in the year A.D. 102,<sup>9</sup> and a statue of Venus is given to the *dendrophori* [*ob onorim* (sic) *immunitatatis* (sic)].<sup>10</sup> An *immunis* gives a statue of

<sup>1</sup> Waltzing, iii. No. 183.<sup>2</sup> *Jb.* iii. No. 1698.<sup>3</sup> *C.I.L.* xiii. 6324.<sup>4</sup> *Jb.* xiii. 2002.<sup>5</sup> *C.I.L.* xiii. 6450.<sup>6</sup> Waltzing, iii. No. 479.<sup>7</sup> *Jb.* xiii. 3026.<sup>8</sup> *Jb.* vi. 8826.<sup>9</sup> *Jb.* xiv. 107.

Caracalla  
reason;  
honoris  
various  
combina  
has fail  
those co  
various  
Diuus  
annonae  
ciuilibus,  
though  
cases it  
claimed  
Waltzing  
municipa

By  
whose m  
enjoyed  
of immu  
seems to  
Waltzing  
we have  
Aper by  
nostri si  
not be c

If,  
Brescia,  
for at th  
such ex

It v  
belonged  
Consul  
inscripti  
inscripti  
is borne  
as well  
(v)  
found w  
would b  
nothing  
meeting

<sup>10</sup> *C.I.L.*  
<sup>11</sup> Vol.

Caracalla and a gift of money to the *cannophori*,<sup>1</sup> presumably for the same reason; and we find also gifts of a marble base (no doubt the base of a statue) *honoris causa*,<sup>2</sup> and there are other examples. These immunities were given for various reasons and are fully discussed and classified by Waltzing;<sup>3</sup> but the combination of *immunitas collegii* may quite well have a sense which Dr. Ashby has failed to note. From the times of Claudius certain colleges, especially those connected with the supply of Rome, had been granted exemptions from various burdens, and by the second century these were regularized and common. *Dius Hadrianus rescipsit immunitatem navium maritimarum habere qui annonae urbis serviunt* (*Dig.* 50, 6, 6 (5) § 5). This immunity was a *muneribus civilibus*, or *municipalibus* or *publicis*. It was not confined to gilds of sailors, though they seem to have been among the most highly privileged. In certain cases it included *tutela uacatio*; but in the time of Trajan the *domini navium* claimed but failed to obtain this exemption *inter privilegia*, which seems, as Waltzing says, to prove that from this time they were exempt from *munera municipalia*.<sup>4</sup>

By the time of Callistratus (end of the second century) all corporations whose members' trades contributed to the public advantage (*publicis utilitatibus*) enjoyed '*immunitas*.'<sup>5</sup> It may then be fairly urged that the natural meaning of *immunitas collegii* is an 'immunity which a gild enjoys.' The exact phrase seems to occur only once among the large number of inscriptions collected by Waltzing, and in this case it has precisely the meaning which I suggest. At Brescia we have an honorific inscription to *M. Nonius M. f. Fabia Arrius Paulinus Aper* by the *collegium dendrophorum quod eius industria immuni[t]* | *as collegi nostri sit confirma[ta]*.<sup>6</sup> The evidence which this inscription affords can certainly not be disregarded in discussing the meaning of our Caerwent inscription.

If, then, at Caerwent *immunitas collegii* has the same meaning as at Brescia, it would be additional evidence that we should read *colleg. n(autarum)*, for at the time our dedication was made it was to these gilds especially that such exemptions were made.

It would be interesting, but perhaps vain to suggest that our *M. Nonius* belonged to the same family as the *M. Nonius* at Brescia, who may have been Consul in A.D. 207, or in the reign of Alexander Severus. Mommsen on this inscription gives a list of other members of his family, whose names occur in inscriptions. All but one belong to the tribe *Fabia*. The cognomen *Romanus* is borne by none of them, but it was certainly borne by men of senatorial rank as well as by freedmen. (See Dessau, *Prosopographia imperii Romani*.)

(v) It seems reasonable to suggest that the place where this stone was found was actually the '*schola*,' or, if it be a veterans' gild, the *curia* (the words would have the same meaning) of the *collegium*. We know indeed little or nothing of these meeting places. Religious and funeral gilds often had their meeting places in temples; but of the exact plan of those of professional or

<sup>1</sup> *C.I.L.* xiv. 119.

<sup>2</sup> *Vol. i.* p. 490.

<sup>3</sup> *vi.* 2191.

<sup>4</sup> *Vol. ii.* p. 402.

<sup>5</sup> *Dig.* 50, 6, 6 (5) § 12.

<sup>6</sup> *C.I.L.* v. 4341.

trade gilds we have little or no information. The word *schola*, Waltzing maintains, implies nothing definite as to shape, which might be rectangular, polygonal or circular.<sup>1</sup> But there seem to be two more or less permanent characteristics, viz. the bench where the members sat and the altar, for 'la schola était à la fois le local et le temple du collège'.<sup>2</sup>

Rooms 5 and 6 of House XI, where our inscribed stone was found, originally formed without doubt one room (see *supra*); and this room has in it a base of masonry about three feet square, symmetrically placed as regards the E. and W. walls and some four feet from the S. wall, the object of which we had regarded, as Dr. Ashby rightly says, as uncertain. But it seems now almost certain that this was the base of the altar; and the shallow recess in the south wall about five feet long—with relation to which the base is placed quite symmetrically—may well have been the niche in which the statue of Mars was placed. There are no certain traces of benches, but these may of course quite well have been of wood.

Further, Waltzing tells us that the *scholae* of trade gilds were often found in the quarter where the members worked. The situation of this building is near the south gate, which seems as far as we have yet discovered to have no relation to any road leading southward, but may well have been related to the stream which flows a little below the city, and which lower down forms Caldecot Pill. This stream is now only a brook; but two thousand years ago it was undoubtedly much wider and was probably tidal. It is too early to dogmatize on this point; further excavation can alone settle this question. But it may not be unwise to note here the possible relation between the situation of the *schola*, if it be one, and the south gate.

Lastly, one final suggestion may be hazarded. Is it possible that the gild, if it be one of sailors, was largely composed of veterans, who coming from the Rhine would naturally be apt for such a calling? This suggestion would account for the dedication to Mars and would give us a fairly harmonious and satisfactory explanation of all our difficulties.

It has, moreover, the support of an inscription at Carnuntum,<sup>3</sup> . . . [m]agistri coll[egii] ves[er]ianoru(m) centonari | oru(m) im | pensis s(uis) p(osuerunt). Waltzing, indeed, inclines to the view that this implies two distinct gilds,<sup>4</sup> but both Mommsen and Hirschfeld hold that it indicates a gild of *centonarii* composed of veterans. The *centonarii* apparently discharged the duties of a public fire brigade, and it is not unnatural to suppose that veterans might have also undertaken the equally public service on the rivers.

A. TRICE MARTIN.

*Note.*—I have been unable satisfactorily to examine inscriptions referring to *collegia*, which have been found since the publication of Waltzing's book in 1900.

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 221.

<sup>2</sup> C.I.L. iii. 11097.

<sup>3</sup> Waltzing, vol. ii. p. 206.

<sup>4</sup> Id. *ib.* p. 223.

THE  
Aristotle;  
it fail, and  
for instan  
Pol. 1257  
ἀλλά witho  
and it has  
must be  
question.

In th  
represents  
'than': t  
expressed  
neither of  
the passag

In th  
The exce  
so Plato,  
θέρην ἄξι  
ἀλλ' Ἀπρί  
that the  
are comb  
may tran  
For insta

Cate  
than, not  
Top  
ἡ τῶ σφ  
N. I  
(other th

<sup>1</sup> The pass  
may be foun  
<sup>2</sup> So also (e  
Kühner does  
the first, not  
ages of the

z, Waltzing  
rectangular,  
permanent  
ar, for 'la

was found,  
n has in it  
regards the  
which we  
seems now  
v recess in  
e is placed  
ue of Mars  
of course

ften found  
uilding is  
o have no  
ted to the  
s Caldecot  
go it was  
dogmatize  
at it may  
on of the

the gild,  
from the  
on would  
rious and

m]agistri  
osuerunt).

ilds,<sup>4</sup> but  
arii com-  
a public  
ave also

ARTIN.

223.

## ON THE USE OF ἄλλ' ἢ IN ARISTOTLE.

THE idiomatic use of ἄλλ' ἢ found in classical writers is familiar in Aristotle; but there is a set of passages for which the ordinary renderings of it fail, and the difficulty is such that the text has been suspected. Bonitz, for instance, Index Aristotelicus, 33<sup>b</sup> 20,<sup>1</sup> says of two of these passages, Pol. 1257<sup>b</sup> 21, Metaph. 1038<sup>a</sup> 14, that ἀλλά is enough by itself, or even that ἀλλά without ἢ seems required (ubi ipsum ἀλλά vel sufficit vel requiri videatur), and it has been proposed in the second of these places to read ᾗ for ἢ. It must be contended that the text is sound in all the difficult passages in question.

In the Aristotelian usage three stages may be distinguished. The first represents the natural origin of the idiom, and here ἄλλ' ἢ may be rendered 'than': the second a modification of the first, where the meaning can be expressed by 'except': the third represents a further modification where neither of these translations can be given by itself, and to this class belong the passages which cause the difficulty.

In the first set of passages a general negation is followed by an exception. The exception might be introduced by ἀλλά alone, as indicating a contrast; so Plato, Laws, 710 C εὐτυχής . . . μὴ κατ' ἄλλο, ἀλλὰ τὸ γενέσθαι . . . νομοθέτην ἄξιον ἐπαίνου (Ast's Lexicon), Dem. c. Mid. 554. 15, μηδένα ἔτερον . . . ἄλλ' Ἀρίσταρχον. But the negative clause contains a word of comparison, so that the exception could be introduced by ἢ alone. The two constructions are combined<sup>2</sup> in ἄλλ' ἢ, and in consequence of the word of comparison we may translate 'than,' or 'but,' when 'but' can be the equivalent of 'than.' For instance:

Categ. 3<sup>b</sup>. οὐδὲν γὰρ ἄλλο σημαίνει τὸ λευκὸν ἄλλ' ἢ ποιόν (nothing else than, nothing but).

Top. 103<sup>a</sup> 20. τὸ δ' ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς κρήνης ὕδωρ οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ διαφέρει ἄλλ' ἢ τῷ σφοδροτέρῳ εἶναι τὴν ὁμοιότητα.

N. Eth. 1124<sup>b</sup> 31. ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἄλλον μὴ δύνασθαι ζῆν ἄλλ' ἢ πρὸς φίλον (other than a friend). There are many passages of this type.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The passages from Aristotle quoted in this article may be found, with others, in the Index Aristotelicus.

<sup>2</sup> So also (e.g.) Kühner, Gr. Gr. ii. § 535, 6, Anm. 3. Kühner does not distinguish the second category from the first, nor does he recognise the existence of passages of the third category at all. Madvig, who held

that ἄλλ' ἢ represented ἄλλο ἢ, the accent being wrong, perhaps thought the combination of constructions unlikely; but μάλλον ἢ οὐ is a still more striking combination of adversative constructions.

<sup>3</sup> For Platonic examples see Ast's Lexicon, vol. i. p. 202.



In the second stage the negative clause no longer contains a word of comparison, and in strict grammar the exception would not be introduced by  $\eta$  alone. Nevertheless the notion of comparison may be so involved in a negative expression that it can be followed by  $\eta$  alone, or by  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$  alone. Cf. Xen. Cyr. 2. 3. 10, οὐδὲ παρ' ἐνὸς οὐδὲ τοῦτο μαθὼν . . .  $\eta$  παρὰ τῆς φύσεως; ib. 7. 5. 41 μηδένα παρίναι  $\eta$  τοὺς φίλους (Kühner, Gr. Gr. ii. § 542, An. 4), Eur. Hipp. 638 οὔτις ἄλλ' ἐγώ (Kühner, 535. 5). Thus the combination  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$   $\eta$  is retained as in the first stage, but unless a word of comparison is supplied it cannot be translated 'than.' The meaning is expressed by 'except,' or 'but,' when 'but' can be equivalent to 'except.'

Post An. 74<sup>b</sup> 16. ἐξ ἀναγκαίων δ' οὐκ ἔστι (συλλογίσασθαι) ἄλλ'  $\eta$  ἀποδεικνύτα; as if οὐκ ἄλλως ἔστιν ἄλλ'  $\eta$  ἀποδεικνύτα.

Metaph. 1005<sup>a</sup> 12. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐ τοῦ γεωμέτρου θεωρῆσαι τί τὸ ἐναντίον  $\eta$  τέλειον  $\eta$  οὐ  $\eta$  ἐν  $\eta$  ταῦτόν  $\eta$  ἕτερον ἄλλ'  $\eta$  ἐξ ὑποθέσεως.

Politics, 1305<sup>b</sup> 14. διὰ τὸ ὀλίγους μετέχειν, καὶ καθάπερ εἴρηται, εἰ πατήρ, υἱὸν μὴ μετέχειν, μηδ' εἰ πλείους ἀδελφοί, ἄλλ'  $\eta$  τὸν πρεσβύτατον.

Poetics, 1455<sup>a</sup> 4. ὅτι ὁμοίως τις ἐλίλυθεν, ὁμοίως δὲ οὐθεὶς ἄλλ'  $\eta$  'Ορέστης (no one except, no one but).

There are also a considerable number of passages of this kind.

In the third stage the idiom has undergone a further and more important modification through another change in the form of the negative clause. Instead of a general negative statement, the negation is made only in certain instances which are intended as illustrations of it, but with the implication of the general negative to which exception is to be made. This implication causes the same construction as in the second class of passages, but owing to the ellipse the simple translation 'except' is no longer possible, and a clause must be introduced before it representing the general negative.

The form is, 'A is not B<sub>1</sub> nor B<sub>2</sub> nor B<sub>3</sub>, etc. [and, in general, no B] except B<sub>4</sub>,' or 'A is not B<sub>1</sub> etc. [nor indeed any B] except B<sub>4</sub>,' or 'A is not B<sub>1</sub> or B<sub>2</sub>, etc., indeed only B<sub>4</sub>.' Hist. An. 563<sup>b</sup> 19 (Aristotle is contending that the cuckoo is not a form which the falcon takes at a certain season). ἔστι δ' ὁ μὲν ἱέραξ γαμψώνυχος, ὁ δὲ κόκκυξ οὐ γαμψώνυχος ἔτι δὲ οὐδὲ τὰ περὶ τὴν κεφαλὴν ἔοικεν ἱέρακι, ἄλλ' ἄμφω ταῦτα περιστέρη μάλλον ἄλλ'  $\eta$  κατὰ τὸ χρῶμα μόνον προσέοικεν ἱέρακι.

The denial is here made in the principal cases with the implication that it is generally valid. '... Nor is the cuckoo like the falcon in the head either: (indeed there is no likeness) except that it is like the falcon in colour only.'

Ib. 580<sup>a</sup> 20. εἰ δ' ἔστιν ὁ χρόνος οὗτος τῆς κήσεως  $\eta$  μὴ ἔστιν οὐδὲν πω συνῶπται μεχρὶ γε τοῦ νῦν, ἄλλ'  $\eta$  ὅτι λέγεται μόνον.

The meaning is that there is nothing to go upon in the matter but hearsay; but the negation is expressed only for the principal source of evidence. 'We have not the evidence of searching observation: (nor indeed any evidence)

but hearsay (nor anything)

Meta  
 $\eta$  ὑπόπουν.  
λέγει καλὰ  
ἀσχεστον.

Here  
probably  
divided in  
"animal  
no other  
"with un

The  
same cate

Poli  
χρημάτων

Inst  
ceeded, a  
the gene

'No

most (or  
In the l  
and this  
every wa

The

indices)

Philippu  
 $\eta$  συνεχ

ξένους μ  
ἔσται].

ἔστω w  
Mr

produce  
Πασίων

παρὰ τ

ὅτι χρη  
seem to

syllable.

TI  
Kühner

<sup>1</sup> Newm  
constructi  
354 B), w



but hearsay.' Or 'We do not know anything about it through investigation, (nor anything about it at all) except only that it is so reported.'

Metaph. 1038<sup>a</sup> 10. πάλιν τοῦ ζῶον τοῦ ὑπόποδος τὴν διαφορὰν δεῖ εἰδέναι ἢ ὑπόπου. ὥστ' οὐ λεκτέον τοῦ ὑπόποδος τὸ μὲν πτερωτὸν τὸ δὲ ἄπτερον, ἐάντερ λέγη καλῶς, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἀδυνατεῖν ποιήσει τοῦτο, ἀλλ' ἢ τὸ μὲν σχιζόπου τὸ δ' ἄσχιστον, αὐτὰι γὰρ διαφοραὶ ποδός.

Here the negation is made for the principal case concerned, for Aristotle probably has in mind a current definition of ζῶον, in which ὑπόπου was divided into πτερωτὸν and ἄπτερον. 'We cannot, properly speaking, divide "animal with feet" into "feathered" and "featherless," as people do who see no other way, (and in general into nothing) except "with divided feet" and "with undivided feet."'

The following passage is somewhat different in form, but belongs to the same category:<sup>1</sup>

Politics, 1257<sup>b</sup> 21. ἡ κατηλικὴ ποιητικὴ χρημάτων, οὐ πάντως, ἀλλ' ἢ διὰ χρημάτων μεταβολῆς.

Instead of a general negation we have a partial negation, οὐ πάντως, succeeded, as in the other examples of this class, by the construction proper to the general negation.

'Not in every way'—οὐ πάντως—might have opposed to it 'though in most (or many) ways,' or 'indeed in no way but one (or a few exceptions).' In the latter case οὐ πάντως indicate the general denial by a kind of litotes, and this is what is in the writer's mind in the present passage. 'Not in every way, indeed only in the way of exchange.'

The only instance I have been able to find (by help of grammars and indices) of the third kind of passage in other writers is Demosthenes contra Philippum, 45. 13—δυνάμιν τινα ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι φημί προχειρίσασθαι δεῖν ὑμᾶς, ἢ συνεχῶς πολεμῶσει καὶ κακῶς ἐκείνον ποιήσει. μὴ μοι μυρίους μὴδὲ δισμυρίους ξένους μὴδὲ τὰς ἐπιστολιμαίους ταύτας δυνάμεις, ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἕστω [v.l. ἔσται]. But the text is uncertain: perhaps a difficilior lectio ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἕστω was altered to ἀλλ' ἢ τῆς πόλεως ἔσται.

Mr. Henderson, of New College, has pointed out to me that Blass has produced one by emendation in Demosthenes pro Phormione, § 43.—οὐδὲ γὰρ Πασίων ὁ σὸς πατὴρ ἐκτίσαθ' εὐρὼν οὐδὲ τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ παραδόντος, ἀλλ' ἢ παρὰ τοῖς αὐτοῦ κυρίοις Ἀντισθένης καὶ Ἀχαιστράτω τραπέζιταινοσι πείραν δοῖς ὅτι χρηστός ἐστι καὶ δίκαιος, ἐπιστεύθη. One MS. (A) has ἀλλη, the remainder seem to have ἀλλὰ (Sandys): in order to avoid the conjunction of three short syllables Blass conjectured ἀλλ' ἢ, quoting Thucyd. v. 60 in support of it.

The passage, however, from Thucydides is not a parallel. It might be if Kühner's interpretation of it were right, but it is erroneous. The passage is

<sup>1</sup> Newman's note on this passage, from the kind of construction to which he assimilates it (Plato, Protag. 354 B), would amount to putting it in the second

category. It would belong to the second if we had οὐδαμῶς instead of οὐ πάντως.

as follows: καὶ οἱ μὲν ταῦτα εἰπόντες τῶν Ἀργείων ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν καὶ οὐ τοῦ πλήθους κελεύσαντος εἶπον· καὶ ὁ Ἄγης δεξάμενος τοὺς λόγους αὐτὸς καὶ οὐ μετὰ τῶν πλεόνων οὐδὲ αὐτὸς βουλευσάμενος, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ κοινώσας τῶν ἐν τέλει ξυστρατευομένων σπένδεται κ.τ.έ.

Kühner (ii. § 535, 6) renders 'sich nicht mit mehreren noch *mit sich allein* berathend,' and thinks the ἢ due to the comparative πλεόνων. But τῶν πλεόνων corresponds to τοῦ πλήθους, and the sense plainly is that just as the two Argives made their offer to Agis without consulting the general body (πλήθος) of commanders on their side, so Agis did not consult the general body of commanders (οἱ πλείους) on his side either (οὐδὲ αὐτός), when he accepted the offer, except that he communicated with one of the commanders. This, therefore, is a quite clear instance of the second class of passages, and so of a common kind.

J. COOK WILSON.

THE  
upon a  
correct st  
itself is  
Transacti  
to compl  
paper, the  
index of  
some mis  
last editi

My  
Jowet  
explanation  
the asserti  
their seat  
After  
τῆς ξυμμί  
and how  
γίγνωσθον)  
to it is t  
classified  
pleasure is  
subject is  
εἶδος, the  
ἀπειρον, an  
is one of  
and κοινὸν

In  
did not  
subsequen  
some pre  
me to lo

The  
senting t  
does not  
them spe  
first edit  
ation in

In  
the *Prole*  
the *Prole*

PLATO, *PHILEBUS*, 31 C.

THE excellent article in the January number of the *Classical Quarterly* upon a mistaken interpretation of *Philebus* 31 C contains the somewhat incorrect statement that this interpretation is the general one: and the article itself is anticipated by a short note in a paper which I published in the *Transactions of the Oxford Philological Society* for 1881-2. I have nothing to complain of, for (as will appear) it may partly serve me right. Besides, my paper, though duly registered in the *Revue de Philologie*, is omitted from the index of that periodical; the aforesaid *Transactions* are out of print, and by some mischance my correction of the wrong rendering did not appear in the last edition of Jowett's *Plato*, though Jowett intended it should.

My note was as follows:

Jowett, Introduction to *Philebus*, page 3, second edition, 'Many points require further explanation; e.g. the reference of pleasures to the indefinite class (31 A) compared with the assertion which almost immediately follows, that pleasure and pain naturally have their seat in the third or mixed class: these two statements are unreconciled.'

After classifying pleasure under *ἀπειρον*—the other classes being *πέρως*, *μικτόν*, *αἰρία* τῆς *ἐνμύθεως*—Plato next (31 A) inquires 'in what subject pleasure and knowledge reside and how they arise in that subject' (*ἐν ᾧ τί ἐστιν ἑκάτερον αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τί πάθος γίγνεται*). The new question is not about the classification of pleasure. The answer to it is that pleasure is *ἐν τῷ κοινῷ γένει*: which means not that pleasure is to be classified in the *κοινὸν γένος* (i.e. in the *μικτὸν γένος*), but that the subject of which pleasure is an attribute is the *μικτὸν γένος*, that is a member of the class *μικτόν*. This subject is further on (32 A) explained to be *τὸ ἐκ τοῦ ἀείρου καὶ πέρωτος ἐμψύχων γεγονὸς εἶδος*, the animal nature (*ζῷον*). Pleasure then, according to Plato, belongs to the class *ἀπειρον*, and resides in subjects which belong to the class *μικτόν*. The only ambiguity is one of expression; in *ἐν τῷ κοινῷ γένει* the preposition does not refer to classification, and *κοινὸν γένος* is put loosely for certain members of the *κοινόν* or *μικτὸν γένος*.

In justice to Stallbaum I should have added that, though possibly he did not express himself with sufficient clearness to be understood by some subsequent commentators, he certainly took the passage rightly: but owing to some preoccupation, which I do not seek to excuse, it did not even occur to me to look at Stallbaum at the time.

The writer of the article in the January *Classical Quarterly*, when representing the misinterpretation as 'general,' could not have been aware that it does not occur in some of the most important commentators, and that one of them specially warns against it in more than one edition. Stallbaum in his first edition points out the possibility of a mistake, and gives the right explanation in the *Prolegomena*, p. lxx: under the text there is a short note only.

In Stallbaum's last edition, 1842, the matter is referred to, as before, in the *Prolegomena* (p. 47), and a longer note, almost identical with the passage in the *Prolegomena* of the first edition, is given under the text. This is as follows:

Sedem voluptatis atque doloris in mixto genere quaerendam esse censet. Id quod fortasse alicui primo certe aspectu mirum videatur. Nam voluptas antea ad τὸ ἀπείρον referebatur. Enimvero probe discernenda est quaestio antea instituta, de genere voluptatis in se spectatae, ab ea quae nunc suscipitur de sede et origine doloris ac voluptatis. Dicitur igitur nunc voluptas ac dolor in τῇ κοινῇ sive ξυμμοσγομένῳ inesse, propterea, nisi fallor, quod omnia animalia ipsique homines, in quos voluptatis ac doloris sensus cadit, ad τὴν γεγεννημένην οὐσίαν referri debent; quidquid vero aut infinitum tantum est aut finitum, id voluptatis aut doloris capax esse non potest; neque enim in eo harmoniae vel dissolutio vel restitutio locum habet, in qua una voluptatis et doloris causam atque originem positam esse docetur.

Bekker's edition (1826) of the works of Plato, with explanatory notes derived from a number of commentators, repeats the short note under the text of Stallbaum's first edition.

In the German edition with translation and notes by Dr. F. W. Wagner (Leipzig, 1857), the translation is such as accords with a right understanding of the passage, and this is confirmed by the short analysis in the Introduction, p. xx.

Coming to the English commentators, the mistake is not found in Poste (edition with commentary 1860, translation 1860). There is no note in his commentary, and from this, considering his accuracy and conscientiousness, one may be sure, even if there were no other evidence, that he took the passage rightly. For if he had not he would have felt the obvious difficulty about the classification which the mistake involves, felt by all who have made the mistake, and he would certainly have mentioned it. Further, editing the *Philebus* after Stallbaum, he was certain to have studied him carefully—he quotes Stallbaum in a near context—and if he had disagreed with him on such a point would have said so. Doubtless he agreed with Stallbaum that there was no difficulty at all if the words were only read attentively (at vero nullas prorsus hic inuenimus difficultates modo verba diligenter et attente legerimus), and then it was in keeping with Poste's self-restraint to say nothing about it. Poste's translation quite confirms this, for he follows Stallbaum's use of 'sedes,' the word by which Stallbaum marked the true nature of the question asked in 31 B (it is italicised in his first edition<sup>1</sup>). Poste translates 31 B 'We must next inquire where each is seated'; and 31 C 'I think both pleasure and pain have their seat in the mixed class.' Again, in Poste's analysis of the argument the text is treated as assigning Pleasure to the class of the ἀπείρον only.

The wrong rendering is found in Badham, Paley, and Bury. Paley may have got it from Jowett or Badham, for he studied both carefully; but he adds some singular mistakes of his own. Bury's note seems to combine those of Badham and Paley. The able writer of the article in the January number of the *Classical Quarterly* appears to have been thinking of Bury and Badham.

J. COOK WILSON.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also *Prolegomena* of last edition, p. 47, 'Itaque facile apparet sapientissime philosophum voluptatis atque doloris sedem [not pleasure itself] ad tertium genus retulisse, neque hoc in re ipsum secum pugnare

dicendum esse.' It is true Jowett has 'seat' in his own translation, but one suspects he followed Poste's translation without seeing the special point of it.

DISSATI

(vv. 1-24),

of the poem

criticised, an

*Classical Re*

But the dif

remain, and

I shall

treatment of

with adequa

Let us

which he is

This, as Mr.

date between

in progress.

latter half o

or even as e

iteratio, whic

summer sol

exiles agri

autumnal ec

come (l. 19)

subjoined.

Faunius (l.

to the rising

summer sol

we are poin

part of Jun

But now

the winter

<sup>1</sup> Horace, *Od*

this connexion.

vice veris et Fa

## ON SOME TIBULLIAN PROBLEMS.

### I. THE FEAST OF LUSTRATION IN II. I.

DISSATISFIED with current views upon the exordium of Tibullus II. i. (vv. 1-24), I proposed in *Selections from Tibullus* (1903) to make the occasion of the poem the *Sementinae Feriae* instead of the *Ambarvalia*. This proposal, criticised, amongst others, by Mr. Warde Fowler in an interesting article in the *Classical Review* (xxii. 1908, pp. 36 sqq.), I have now abandoned (*ib.* p. 40 b). But the difficulties which led me to break away from previous exegesis still remain, and to them I address myself in the present article.

I shall assume that these difficulties do not arise from lax or 'poetical' treatment of facts, and that here, as elsewhere, Tibullus writes upon rustic matters with adequate knowledge and care.

Let us collect the indications which he gives of the season of the festival which he is here describing. Firstly, a lamb is mentioned as the offering (15). This, as Mr. Fowler says (l.c. p. 37), is not decisive, but it is consistent with any date between the middle of January and, say, the end of June. Ploughing, again, is in progress. This may be the *proscissio* which in *uliginosi campi* took place in the latter half of April (Columella, ii. 4. 3), but in *colles pinguis soli* (*ib.* § 9) in March, or even as early as February in mild weather or dry districts. Or it may be the *iteratio*, which is to be accomplished after the middle of April and before the summer solstice (§§ 4, 9). The *tertiatio*, which, like the *proscissio* and *iteratio* of *exiles agri* (§ 11), took place in the beginning of September (§ 4) or about the autumnal equinox (§ 9), it cannot be, since Tibullus refers to the harvest as yet to come (l. 19). To Columella's statements those of Varro, *R.R.* i. 28, may be subjoined. He mentions ploughing in the period between the first blowing of Faunus (Feb. 7) and the vernal equinox, in that from the vernal equinox to the rising of the Pleiads (May 8), and again in that which ended with the summer solstice, the first two periods being the most important.<sup>1</sup> So far, then, we are pointed to a date between the earlier part of February and the latter part of June.

But now we come to the passage which seemed to me clearly to indicate the winter and therefore to be incompatible with any date that could be

<sup>1</sup> Horace, *Odes*, I. iv., is especially interesting in this connexion. He refers to *Faunus* in l. 1, 'grata uice ueris et Fauni.' A lamb is mentioned in 12, and

in 3 the cattle are no longer in sheds or the ploughman by the fire ('neque iam stabulis gaudet pecus aut arator igni').

assigned to an Ambarualian festival or *agrorum lustratio* (l. 1 'fruges lustramus et agros'). It follows on the prayer in lines 17-20.

di patrii, purgamus agros, purgamus agrestes :  
uos mala de nostris pellite limitibus.  
neu seges eludat messem fallacibus herbis  
neu timeat celeres tardior agna lupos.  
tunc nitidus plenis confusus rusticus agris  
ingeret ardenti grandia ligna foco ;  
turbaque uernarum, satori bona signa coloni,  
ludet et ex uirgis extruet ante casas.  
euentura precor : uiden' ut felicibus extis  
significet placidos nuntia fibra deos?

20

25

I had supposed the time contemplated in *tunc* to be immediate, and the connexion of thought to be 'Grant the farmer's prayer, and he may thereupon to-day, with full confidence in the future, indulge his genius in his cheerful home,' but I now believe (as I wrote to Mr. Fowler, l.c. p. 38 a) that its reference is prospective and to a period posterior to anything in the context.

Mr. Fowler accepts this interpretation of *tunc*, but holds an entirely different theory as to the purport of the passage. For his defence of it, which rests upon some undeniable though, I believe, accidental ambiguities, I must refer to his own article ; but its presentation may be condensed as follows. 'The poem and the *lustratio* it describes belong to the spring.' 'The omens are favourable, the *lustratio* is successful, and the husbandman may look forward to the time when the crops are no longer in danger (*confusus plenis agris*, which he understands as feeling every confidence in the fields full of the now ripe or ripening corn), and when he will be able to take his part in the general rejoicings with a light heart.' These 'general rejoicings' he finds in 22-24. 22 *ardenti foco* he understands of 'a midsummer bonfire or of an altar-fire at a summer festival,' inclining apparently to the former (p. 39 a). And in the next couplet he sees 'a survival of an ancient bit of custom or ritual in which the *uernae* took part, making booths or tabernacles out of *uirgae*. To this he finds parallels in Ovid's account of the feast of Anna Perenna on the Ides of March (*Fasti*, 3. 523), in Tibullus's (ii. 5. 95 sqq.) of an unspecified festival and in Festus's mention of the Neptunalia, July 23, when booths or huts were erected, made of the foliage of trees : 'Vmbrae uocantur Neptunalibus casae frondeae pro tabernaculis' (p. 377). Now the sense, upon which Mr. Fowler bases his theory of a 'ritual' allusion, can be extracted from the Latin of 24, and others have in fact so extracted it, and it may therefore here be submitted to an examination in detail which the enforced brevity of my notes in the *Selections* prevented it there from receiving.

The parallels cited by Mr. Fowler for the custom appear to fail him in an important respect. Why is it not the *coloni* but the *uernae* that make booths of branches here? In Ovid and in Tibullus (ii. 5. 95) this 'bit of ritual' is performed by *freemen*.

In 21 p. Tac. H. 2. 1 of the sown grauidae qu Fowler think through the to encounter the face of adverb show fidence. F has sown is agricolae : s 3. 61 'at til terra fide.'

Need w that the co cold? If s and Ovid, A et arsuris g

In 23 a Mr. Fowler 698 'quid 65 sqq. 'o uescor uern ing a princ urged on n pp. 153-1 parallelism sinu'<sup>13</sup> and interpretati bona signa Juvenal 14 patrem ip quattuor, u

As for game, as is

<sup>1</sup> I have present point like *agris* here

<sup>2</sup> For this, it came later in *opus* nos mo A transition 22. 44, where person in the NO. X.

In 21 *plenis—agris* might certainly mean 'full of the standing corn.' Cf. Tac. *H. 2. 12* 'pleni agri; apertae domus.' But it may just as well mean 'full of the sown seed.' Cf. Ovid, *Fasti*, 4. 633 sq. 'nunc grauidum pecus est; grauidae quoque semine terrae. | telluri plenae uictima plena datur.' *confisus*, Mr. Fowler thinks, 'suits better with crops that have come to maturity and thus passed through the greater part of the perils that beset them than with seed that has yet to encounter so many natural dangers.' But his objection cannot be upheld in the face of Tibullus, i. 9. 45, 'tum miser interii, *stulte confisus amari*,'<sup>1</sup> where the adverb shows *confidere* is just as suitable of unwarranted as of justifiable confidence. Furthermore, the husbandman's trust in the good faith of the land he has sown is an idea that naturally occurs to our poet; ii. 6. 21 sq. 'spes alit agricolae: spes sulcis *credit* aratis | semina, quae magno faenore *reddat* ager,' 3. 61 'at tibi, dura seges, Nemesim quae abducis ab urbe, | *persoluat nulla semina terra fide*.'

Need we adduce proof that the simple and obvious sense of the next line is that the countryman heaps logs upon his blazing hearth to keep out the bitter cold? If so, Hor. *Carm.* i. 9. 5 'dissolue frigus, *ligna super foco | large reponens*' and Ovid, *Fasti*, 4. 509 sq. 'illa domum glandes excussaque mora rubetis | portat et *arsuris grandia ligna focis*' will serve our turn.

In 23 *uernarum* in itself may signify either 'home-born slaves in general' (so Mr. Fowler) or 'home-born slave children,'<sup>2</sup> which is its meaning in Plautus, *Miles*, 698 'quid? *nutrici* non missuru's quicquam quae *uernas* alit?', Horace, *S. ii.* 6. 65 sqq. 'o noctes cenaque deum quibus ipse meique | ante Larem proprium uescor *uernasque* procacis | pasco libatis dapibus'; cf. *Epod.* 2. 65. But, following a principle, the importance of which for the interpretation of Tibullus I have urged on more than one occasion (*Journal of Philology*, xxvi. pp. 87 sq., xxviii. pp. 153-156; *Selections from Tibullus*, p. 208), we shall be guided by the parallelisms of i. 5. 25 sq. 'consuescit amantis | garrulus in dominae *ludere uerna sinu*'<sup>3</sup> and ii. 2. 22 '*ludat* et ante tuos *turba* nouella pedes' to regard the second interpretation as more probable. The youthful *uernae* (the signs of prosperity, *bona signa*) are of course the offspring of the well-fed *colonus* and his *ancillae*. Juvenal 14. 166 sqq. seems a parallel worth quoting, '*saturabat* glaebula talis | patrem ipsum *turbamque* casae qua feta iacebat | uxor et infantes *ludabant* quattuor, unus | *uernula*, tres *domini*.'<sup>4</sup>

As for the last sentence, building houses (*aedificare casas*) was a children's game, as is attested by Hor. *S. ii.* 3. 247 (and 275). And in Tibullus the adverb

<sup>1</sup> I have printed the MS. reading *amari*, as the present point is not thereby affected, but *Amori*, dat. like *agris* here, is extremely probable.

<sup>2</sup> For this, it would seem, the more exact diminutive came later into vogue; Sen. *Dial.* ii. 6 'cogita *filiorum* nos modestia delectari, *uernularum* licentia.' A transition in use seems indicated in Pliny, *N.H.* 22. 44, where *uerta—uernula* are used of the same person in the same context.

NO. X. VOL. III.

<sup>3</sup> It is important to observe that here, the only other place where Tibullus uses *uerna*, it must refer to a child.

<sup>4</sup> Mr. Fowler apparently takes *ludat* as generally indulging in 'jollification,' but in Tibullus, when applied to adults, it would more naturally have the erotic sense of i. 3. 64 and l. 87 of the present poem.



*ante* may refer indifferently to space or to time; see e.g. i. 10. 68 and 78 of our poem.

A reader then who is not in search of survivals of ancient ceremonials<sup>1</sup> may, I think, rest content to interpret this passage as a natural description of a winter scene in an Italian country home. The working year is over, the seed is sown; and the prosperous farmer, blessed with a good harvest and full of trust that the earth will continue to yield him her increase, piles up the cheerful household fire, round which play the little *uernae*, the proofs of his prosperity.<sup>2</sup> And its connexion with what precedes will be by no means obscure. 'Let us celebrate this feast of purification for our crops and herds with all the due traditional rites, and let us in purity and sincerity pray to the country gods to bless us, so that our harvest may not disappoint our just expectations nor the wolf ravage our flocks. Then, when the crops are gathered and the autumn sowing done, we may take our ease at home, looking forward to another prosperous year.'

The exact date of the lustration described by Tibullus, which we may call a private *Ambarualia*, no antiquarian research has been able to determine; doubtless for the reason that it was not fixed but varied with the year, the district, and the convenience of the farmer. The latitude indicated above (p. 127) is countenanced by the language of Virgil, who, while assigning the festival to early spring, *Georg.* i. 339 sqq. 'sacra refer Cereri laetis operatus in herbis, | extremas sub casum hiemis iam uere sereno; | tum pingues agni et tum mollissima uina, | tum somni dulces densaeque in montibus umbrae,' and 345 'terque nouas felix eat hostia fruges,' contemplates nevertheless the possibility of its being celebrated much later, inasmuch as he warns the husbandman that it must be over *before* the corn is cut, 347 sqq. 'neque ante | falcem maturis quisquam supponat aristas | quam Cereri torta redimitus tempora quercu | det motus incompósitos et carmina dicat.' Within this period of the year would fall the small number of datable rustic festivals in various parts of Italy which are mentioned by Wissowa, *Real-Encyclop.* i. p. 1796.

## II. ON LYGDAMVS.

In my *Selections from Tibullus* I contended for the following propositions:

1. *Lygdamus* was the poetaster's real name, while *Neaera*, that of his lady-love, was in all likelihood an assumed one.<sup>3</sup> Though the latter cannot be directly

<sup>1</sup> Tibullus 'is thinking of some local summer festival, otherwise unknown to us' (Mr. Fowler, l.c. p. 40 b. The italics are mine).

<sup>2</sup> For Tibullus's sympathy with children see, besides the two places just quoted, i. 10. 16 and ii. 5. 91 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> Prof. Cartault's argument, *Tibulle* (1909), p. 73 'son nom peut être fictif, mais, comme c'est un nom courant de courtisane, l'hypothèse est peu vraisemblable,' is unconvincing. If *Neaera* was for this

reason unsuitable to be adopted as a soubriquet, it was for the very same reason unsuitable to be retained, contrary to custom, as a real name. *Lygdamus*, we may feel sure, would not stray from the convention. [I take the opportunity of correcting an error in my review of Prof. Cartault's *A propos du Corpus Tibullianum*, *Classical Quarterly*, 1908, p. 225 n. At iv. i. (*Pam.*) 86 his intention was to read 'fontis nêi' (as I said it should be), but his printer made it *uti*.]

established  
etiquette  
*Delia*; P.  
SULPICIA,  
this I do  
not know

2. He  
argument  
inconclusiv  
rights of  
Prof. Cart  
The wealth  
just as im  
that even  
plenty of  
term which  
elsewhere,  
note was  
extremely

1242, 14  
20222, 1

Prof.  
Tibullus.  
that he w  
his imitat  
that I ca  
the death  
B.C. 16, a  
time betw

<sup>1</sup> J. Köhn,  
i. pp. 213 sq

established, there is no reason for assuming a deviation from Roman literary etiquette in such matters. CATULLUS, *Lesbia*; GALLUS, *Lycoris*; TIBULLUS, *Delia*; PROPERTIUS, *Cynthia*; NASO, *Corinna*, etc., to which we may add SULPICIA, *Cerinthus* (*Selections*, p. xxxviii, note (3)). Why any one should dispute this I do not know, except on the ground, surely an insufficient one, that he does not know who Lygdamus was.

2. He was probably a *freedman*. For his name was that of a slave, and the argument for a Roman descent drawn from iii. 1. 2 'nostris—auis' is wholly inconclusive, as 'a new Roman citizen entered as a matter of course into all the rights of the native' (op. cit. p. xlv). I am glad now to have the support of Prof. Cartault, *Tibulle* (1909), p. 74, who refers to Horace, *Carm.* iv. 15. 25 sqq. The wealth attributed to him on the score of the magniloquent phrases of iii. 3 is just as imaginary. 'Wishes,' I said, 'cost nothing,' and Prof. Cartault points out that even if he had wealth, a theory discountenanced by 3. 23 and 5. 31, so had plenty of other freedmen in his times. Further, I drew attention to the peculiar term which he applies to his relation to Neaera: *coniunx* 1. 26 (and note) and elsewhere, *coningium* 4. 79. The researches of two scholars published since my note was written confirm my inference, showing, as they do, that *coniunx* is extremely frequent on the inscriptions of freedmen; *C.I.L.* i. 1053, 1220, 1240, 1242, 1479, 1064, 1413, 1011; vi. 15389, 16306, 21326, 24711, 18616, 20222, 17082.<sup>1</sup>

Prof. Cartault (op. cit. p. 88) conjectures that Lygdamus was a freedman of Tibullus. This of course is possible. But if we are to guess, I prefer the guess that he was the Lygdamus of Cynthia and Propertius, *Selections*, p. xlv n. 2 (where his imitations of Propertius are referred to). There is no chronological difficulty that I can see. Lygdamus is mentioned in Prop. iv. 7. 35, a poem written after the death of Cynthia. But no poem in that book appears to be later than B.C. 16, and on my theory Lygdamus may have published the Third Book any time between B.C. 15 and B.C. 3.

J. P. POSTGATE.

<sup>1</sup>J. Köhn, *Allateinische Forschungen*, p. 86 (on *coniunx*), and E. H. Sturtevant, *Classical Philology*, i. pp. 213 sqq.

## TRAUBE'S *NOMINA SACRA* AND POSTHUMOUS WORKS.

*Nomina Sacra: Versuch einer Geschichte der christlichen Kürzung.* Von LUDWIG TRAUBE, o. ö. Professor der Philologie an der Universität, München. (*Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters.* Herausgegeben von LUDWIG TRAUBE. Zweiter Band). Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1907. Pp. x+295. M. 15.

*Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen.* Von LUDWIG TRAUBE. Herausgegeben von FRANZ BOLL. Erster Band. *Zur Paläographie und Handschriftenkunde.* Herausgegeben von PAUL LEHMANN. Mit biographischer Einleitung von FRANZ BOLL. Munich: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1909. Pp. lxxv+263.

THE term 'nomina sacra' Traube borrowed from Sir E. Thompson, who designated abbreviations ΘC for *θεός*, DS for *deus*, as 'sacred and liturgical contractions' or 'contractions of sacred names.' Roughly speaking, these abbreviations are (with Q. for *que* and B. for *-bus*) the only abbreviations found in Latin majuscule MSS., so that this book provides us with a part of that history of Latin abbreviation, which was to have formed one volume of Traube's great work on Latin Palaeography. Other parts would have dealt with the *Notae Juris* (used in early legal MSS.) and with the large field of minuscule abbreviation; and, no doubt, the symbols found on inscriptions would not have been left unnoticed.

Latin majuscule abbreviation engrosses the fourth section of this book. The third gives us full details of the Greek contractions of 'nomina sacra,' while the fifth and sixth pursue the same investigation in Coptic, Gothic, Armenian, and Slavonic MSS. All these details Traube makes subservient to the theory which dominates the book, the theory that abbreviation by contraction is of Hebrew origin. The Jewish practice of obscuring by a symbol (the Tetragram) the name of the Supreme Being, was imitated by Greek translators of the Jewish Scriptures in the symbols ΘC, KC, etc., and by Latin translators of these Greek versions in the symbols DS, XPS, DNS, etc. Since the production of manuscripts was in the hands of monks, this method of abbreviating sacred names was extended in course of time to other words also. The phrases 'deus meus,' 'deus noster,' at first written DS MEUS, DS NOSTER, came to be written DS MS, DS NR; and, little by little, the practice was extended in

TRA  
Latin m  
curiously  
Read  
startled i  
has dem  
these ear  
the benef  
words, I  
Abbr  
letter (or  
syllables)  
DOM. (or  
the final  
initial let  
We must  
of the sec  
'abbrevia  
of abbrev  
characteri  
Greek pa  
πῶδας, π  
(or CS.)  
symbols  
since any  
come to  
have a s  
number o  
word inva  
tion of a  
had rema  
for 'deo'  
sents *spi*  
Spirit.'  
Romanus  
earlier th  
symbols  
Primasiu  
*dominus*  
old Gree  
traction-s  
sense. I  
freely use  
over-step

Latin mediaeval MSS. over a large number of words, although in Greek, curiously enough, it remained almost wholly restricted to 'nomina sacra.'

Readers of the book will, I think, soon abandon their first attitude of startled incredulity, and will acknowledge with grateful admiration that Traube has demonstrated the truth of his theory, as fully as the scanty records of these early Greek and Latin versions of the Bible admit of demonstration. For the benefit of those who have not the opportunity of reading Traube's own words, I will give in outline the course of his arguments.

Abbreviations in MSS. are of two kinds, (1) by Suspension, when the initial letter (or letters) of the word (or the initial letter of each or some of the syllables) is unaccompanied by the final letter, e.g. **D**. 'deus,' 'dei,' 'deo,' etc., **DOM**. (or **DMN**.) 'dominus,' 'domini,' 'domino,' etc.; (2) by Contraction, when the final letter of the word is written along with the initial letter (or the initial letter of each or some of the syllables), e.g. **DΘ** 'deo,' **DNΘ** 'domino.' We must in future use the term 'contraction' (or 'abbreviation by contraction') of the second kind only, and use for the other kind the term 'suspension' (or 'abbreviation by suspension'). Suspension is the Pagan or pre-Christian form of abbreviation; contraction does not appear until the Christian period, and is characteristic of Christian writings. The abbreviations used in the literary Greek papyri are suspensions, e.g. **κ'** for **καὶ** (whence **κῶρι** for **καὶ ῥῶ**), **πoδ** for **πόδας**, **πολ'** for **πόλεμον**. So are the symbols of Latin Inscriptions, e.g. **C**. (or **CS**.) for 'consul' (-lis, -li, etc.), **IMP**. for 'imperator' (-ris, -ri, etc.). These symbols are accompanied by a dot, and are evidently designed to save space, since any word of common occurrence is symbolized in this way. When we come to Christian times, we find three changes. Christian abbreviation-symbols have a suprascript stroke instead of a dot, e.g. **D̄Θ** for 'deo': only a limited number of words (the 'nomina sacra') are symbolized: the final letter of the word invariably accompanies the initial. It was the second of these, the restriction of abbreviation to 'nomina sacra,' that led Traube to his discovery. He had remarked many years ago that **DΘ**, etc., never appears in the earliest MSS. for 'deo' in a Pagan sense, but only for the Christian God; **SP̄U** never represents *spiritu* in the sense of 'breath,' but only in the sense of 'the Holy Spirit.' And he had argued (rightly, as is now acknowledged) that the Codex Romanus of Virgil, which has **DΘ** at Aen. i. 303 (cf. Ecl. i. 6), cannot be earlier than the sixth century, the time when the restriction of the use of these symbols began to be relaxed. The (seventh century?) corrector of the Oxford Primasius (Douce 140) regards it as an error wherever he finds *deus* 'God' and *dominus* 'Lord' written in full, and substitutes the contractions. Similarly in an old Greek codex at Milan (A 147 inf.) the scribe himself expands the contraction-symbol which he had inadvertently used for *κύριος* in its non-Christian sense. Indeed it is not until the ninth century that these contractions are freely used in Greek profane writings, and, although the barriers were earlier over-stepped in Latin, there is no lack of indications that even Carolingian

scribes recognized that these contractions were properly Christian symbols. A Carolingian corrector will often substitute *dō* for *deo*, *spū* for *spiritu*, when these words are used in their religious senses, and on the other hand will expand the contractions when the words have no religious significance.<sup>1</sup> And, in fact, Traube's discovery is partly anticipated by the remark of a ninth century writer, Christian of Stavelot, who (in a discussion of the symbol for *Iesus*) mentions, as the reason for these contractions, 'quia nomen dei non potest litteris explicari.' Quando purum hominem significat, per omnes litteras scribitur.' The contraction of 'nomina sacra' was not designed to lighten the labours of the scribe; it was a mark of honour paid to these holy names.

In Hebrew MSS. the names of God were sometimes written in gold, a practice especially prevalent at Alexandria. This was imitated in Greek and Latin MSS. When St. Jerome speaks of Bibles in purple, silver and gold, he means Bibles on purple vellum, with the holiest names in gold, and others in silver; he means, in fact, what we find in the St. Petersburg 'codex purpureus,' in which the contractions of words like *θεός* are written in gold, and of words like *οὐρανός* in silver. The use of the Tetragram in Hebrew MSS. was a similar mark of honour. It was an attempt at concealment of the most holy of all names. Not merely would the omission of the vowels prevent it from being understood by the vulgar, but the priest himself, in reading aloud, used to substitute for it another name. Besides, we hear of a practice of using in this symbol characters taken from an obsolete form of the alphabet. When the sacred books of the Jews were translated into Greek, Aquila (as we see in the newly-found Cambridge fragments) reproduced these four obsolete forms of Hebrew letters, just as he found them written in the Hebrew texts of his own time, with (at least sometimes) a suprascript stroke. Origen used ΠΠΠ, a rough rendering of the current Hebrew letters. Other Greek translators substituted a similarly obscured Greek word with suprascript stroke, ΘC or KC. This was the starting-point of the Greek use of contractions for 'nomina sacra.' New Testament texts came to use similar symbols (with suprascript stroke) for a name like *Ἰησοῦς*, although we know that the earlier practice, when this name was abbreviated, was to use the suspension IH. For the early Christian writers found in the number 318 in Gen. xiv. 14 (the number of Abraham's troop), a mystic reference to the cross (T=300) and to the name of Jesus (*ij*=18). That ΘC and KC were the first of these contractions is indicated by the Egyptian magic papyri of the third and fourth centuries (and probably earlier), in which these two symbols are predominant. These magic papyri show Jewish, not Christian, influence. To the original pair, ΘC and KC, others were gradually

<sup>1</sup> I noticed several examples lately in the ninth century Florence MS. (Ashb. 1899) of Valerius Maximus. The corrector expands the contraction-symbols for *spiritus* (p. 75, l. 28 K.), *dominum* (p. 76, l. 26), *spiritus* (p. 78, l. 4), *spiritus* (p. 82, l. 15), *sanctum* (p. 85, l. 12), etc., etc., just as we

should be driven to correct the wrong use of a small initial letter or a large in similar English words. This MS., I should add, comes from Stavelot; while its twin-brother of Ferrières (now in the Berne Library, No. 366), tolerates the wrong use of the contractions in these passages.

added, at the series church.' (e.g. OS f there are that the larly the 'Iepocóλuy translator originals, which all

This arguments pass over majuscule that Trau tractions about the substitutio had come A full his minuscule that Trau

After that as m opportunit Boll of H lungen von Traube's l famous M Dr. Paul I recent inv sometimes preface to a list of themselves an account bibliograph (in the tor (1) *Einleit lieferungsge Halbuncial Prof. Skuts*

added, at different periods and at different parts of the Greek world, the last in the series being **MHP** for  $\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho$ , probably at first in the sense of 'mother church.' The limited stock of the Latin imitations of these Greek contractions (e.g. **DS** for Greek  $\Theta\varsigma$ , **DNS** or **DMS** for Greek  $\text{Κ}\varsigma$ , **SPS** for Greek  $\Pi\text{Ν}\text{Α}$ , while there are no Latin equivalents of other Greek contractions, e.g. of  $\omicron\upsilon\text{π}\alpha\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$ ) suggests that the earliest Latin translations were made from Syrian Greek texts. Similarly the Greek symbol for 'Jerusalem,'  $\text{Ι}\alpha\eta\mu$  (a contraction not of the Greek  $\text{Ι}\epsilon\rho\sigma\acute{o}\lambda\upsilon\mu\alpha$ , but of the Hebrew form of the name), suggests that the Greek translators took this symbol (and presumably others) from their Hebrew originals, and that the Tetragram was not the isolated Hebrew type, from which all the Greek contractions were formed.

This short outline does not do justice to Traube's detailed statement of his arguments, but may suffice to show something of their strength. I must also pass over the details of his history of the development of contraction in Latin majuscule (partly also in minuscule) script, and content myself with saying that Traube's handling of them shows clearly the great part played by contractions in the corruption of Latin texts. For example, the use (which ceased about the ninth century) of  $\text{n}\acute{o}$  for 'nostro' has caused in later transcripts the substitution of *non* for *nostro*, since the symbol  $\text{n}\acute{o}$  at the time of these transcribers had come to denote 'non,' while *nostro* was denoted by the contraction  $\text{n}\acute{r}\acute{o}$ . A full history of Latin abbreviations, especially of those current in the earliest minuscule script, is urgently required as a help to textual emendation. Would that Traube had been spared to write it!

After Traube's lamented death in May, 1907, the hope was often expressed that as many of his papers as was possible should be published at the earliest opportunity. The publication has been undertaken by his life-long friend, Prof. Boll of Heidelberg, who has, in the first volume of the *Vorlesungen und Abhandlungen von L. Traube*, given us, by way of Preface, a most welcome account of Traube's life and writings. This first volume, containing a selection from the famous Munich lectures on Latin Palaeography, appears under the editorship of Dr. Paul Lehmann. It could not have been put into better hands, for Lehmann's recent investigation into some Itala fragments in the Stuttgart Library comes sometimes very near to the inimitable style of his master. Lehmann adds, as a preface to these lectures, a list of the papers left by Traube, and, as an appendix, a list of the extant Latin MSS. in Capital and in Uncial script. The lectures themselves contain a history of Latin Palaeography (from Mabillon onwards), an account of the transition from papyrus to vellum, an enumeration (with a bibliography) of the chief libraries containing Latin MSS., and some remarks (in the tone of the *Nomina Sacra*) on contractions. Future volumes will be (1) *Einleitung in die mittellateinische Philologie*, edited by Lehmann; (2) *Ueberslieferungsgeschichte der römischen Literatur*, edited by Boll; (3) *Geschichte der Halbunciale*, edited by Lehmann; (4) *Gesammelte kleine Schriften*, edited by Prof. Skutsch of Breslau; and (I hope) *Spanische Symptome* (i.e.  $\text{a}\acute{\text{a}}\text{m}$  for 'autem,'



etc.). Traube's wonderful library (with a huge collection of photographs from Latin MSS.) has been acquired for the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, and will be housed in Berlin.

The *Quellen und Untersuchungen zur lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters* are not to be discontinued. Traube utilized them for the 'opuscula' of his pupils. His teeming brain provided an inexhaustible supply of subjects which he had not time to work out himself and which he handed over to others. In his *O Roma Nobilis* (Munich, 1891) he had shown how great was the influence of Sedulius Scottus on ninth century learning and how many MSS. were written by Sedulius himself or his Irish companions. This line of investigation has been followed out by Dr. Hellmann in the first volume of the series, *Sedulius Scottus*. The next volume deals with a kindred theme, *Johannes Scottus*, by Dr. Rand (now at Harvard). Traube's wonderful edition of the Rule of St. Benedict, the ideal for every editor of a Latin text, brought in its train the third volume, *Untersuchungen zur Ueberlieferungsgeschichte der ältesten lateinischen Mönchsregeln*, by Dr. Plenkens. Another fruitful suggestion of the master, that the records of sixteenth century Latin scholars would throw light on the original home of many extant (and lost) MSS. of Latin classics, led to Lehmann's *Franciscus Modius*, which is to be followed by other treatises of this kind by the same hand. The other volumes of the series which have appeared as yet are Dr. Becker's *Textgeschichte Liudprands von Cremona*, Dr. Loew's *Die ältesten Kalendarien aus Monte Cassino*, Dr. Neff's *Die Gedichte des Paulus Diaconus*. But there are almost as many more 'overflows' from Traube's flood of discovery which are outside this series. His detection of Lupus of Ferrières as the corrector of the Berne MS. of Valerius Flaccus led to Schnetz's *Ein Kritiker des Valerius Maximus im 9 Jahrhundert* (Neuburg a. D., 1901). His projected edition of Ammianus Marcellinus, after his discovery of the text-tradition, was handed over to Dr. Clark. A hint of his on the lessons to be learnt from a comparison of an uncial archetype, the Puteaneus of Livy, with its minuscule transcript in the Vatican, led indirectly to Prof. Shipley's useful booklet on *Certain Sources of Corruption in Latin Manuscripts* (New York, 1904). I mention only a few instances, out of many. Other books of the kind are still to be published—Dr. Loew's account of Beneventan script, Dr. B. A. Mueller's of the 'subscriptions' in Latin MSS. (the traces of ancient editions), etc., etc. What a wonderful record for one who was an invalid for a great part of his life and who died in his forty-sixth year! As I stood some months ago outside his house at Munich I said to myself, 'How many paths have stretched out from this little garden, on this side and on that, into all quarters of the great world of learning!'

W. M. LINDSAY.

## HENDER

*Civil War and R*  
*of Tacitus.*  
of Exeter Co  
xxiii + 360.

EVERY reader of  
the Emperor Ne  
Nor will he be d  
originality of trea  
accurate and tho  
same novel and ev  
at least never fail

The scope of  
with the militar  
chapters dealing  
the Flavian invas

Mr. Henders  
his professed aim  
and as illustrativ  
he agrees with t  
frequent use is m  
not only of wha  
happen.' The di  
course the frequ  
were; its danger  
modern strategic  
crimination to an  
point, which ma  
application of M  
the most part b  
men, whose only  
possible. The re  
subordinate part  
inclined to thin  
last point. Thus  
with a very insu



## HENDERSON'S CIVIL WAR AND REBELLION.

*Civil War and Rebellion in the Roman Empire. A Companion to the Histories of Tacitus.* By BERNARD W. HENDERSON, M.A., Sub-Rector and Tutor of Exeter College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co. 1908. 8vo. Pp. xxiii + 360. Four Illustrations from Busts, Maps and Plans.

EVERY reader of Mr. Henderson's previous work, *The Life and Principate of the Emperor Nero*, will receive his new book with pleasurable anticipation. Nor will he be disappointed. The book is marked by the same freshness and originality of treatment, the same brilliant, if somewhat florid style, the same accurate and thorough knowledge of his subject, and, we may add, by the same novel and even startling suggestions, which, if they do not always convince, at least never fail to interest and attract.

The scope of the present book is narrower, since it is concerned solely with the military history of the famous 'Four Emperors' Year,' the three chapters dealing respectively with the campaign of Otho and the Vitellians, the Flavian invasion of Italy, and the Rebellion on the Rhine.

Mr. Henderson is an enthusiastic student of modern military history, and his professed aim is 'to write the history of these campaigns by the aid of and as illustrative of modern strategical principles.' With this end in view, he agrees with the aphorism of Von der Goltz, of whose *The Nation in Arms* frequent use is made throughout the book, that 'one ought to write the history not only of what actually happens in a war, but of what was intended to happen.' The difficulty of applying this aphorism to the wars of 69 A.D. is of course the frequent uncertainty as to what the intentions of this or that general were; its danger lies in the temptation to infer his intentions from these modern strategical principles, which cannot always be applied without discrimination to ancient warfare. About these particular wars, too, there is another point, which makes them in some respects unfavourable instances for the application of Mr. Henderson's method. They were civil wars, conducted for the most part by second-rate generals, with very imperfect control over their men, whose only thought was to get at the enemy with as little delay as possible. The result was that strategical considerations played a comparatively subordinate part in the conduct of the campaigns. In a few instances, I am inclined to think, Mr. Henderson has not made sufficient allowance for this last point. Thus, in the case of Spurius at Placentia, we have a good general with a very insubordinate army, which compels him against his better judgment

to march out into the open plain in the immediate neighbourhood of Caecina's superior force. Mr. Henderson, disregarding the account of Tacitus, which he puts down to camp gossip, attributes to Spurrina the 'intention' of making a 'reconnaissance in force,' and accordingly reconstructs the whole episode (p. 82). Again, in connection with the first battle of Bedriacum, the main factors were the impatience and insubordination of the Othonian soldiers, and the incompetence of Otho, Titianus and Proculus. The result was a reckless frontal attack. Mr. Henderson—I shall have to return to the point—discards all this, and attributes to Otho the 'brilliant conception' of a 'strategical envelopment' of the Vitellian army (p. 100, foll.). Once more, before the second battle of Bedriacum, the eccentric and circuitous march of the leaderless Vitellian army from Hostilia to Cremona is convincingly explained by Mommsen as due, not to strategical considerations, but to temporary loss of head and loss of nerve on the part of the soldiers. Mr. Henderson is not content with this, but attributes the choice of route to a desire to avoid the strategical dangers of the direct road, dangers, which an examination of the details would, I think, show to be imaginary. Much more legitimate, though I think that Mr. Henderson exaggerates his point, is his attribution to Otho, or, as I should put it, his advisers, of an important strategical motive in the dispatch of the fleet to Gallia Narbonensis (p. 90).

Some of Mr. Henderson's excursions into modern military technicalities, though highly interesting and instructive in themselves, have only a shadowy relation to these campaigns. Thus, the disquisition on pages 43 and 44 on the modern methods of defending mountain passes, throws very little light on the question, whether Otho might or might not have blocked the Alps against the Vitellian armies. Again, the dangerous position of an army, compelled 'to form front to a flank' is dwelt upon in connection with the possibility that the Vitellians might, after occupying Placentia, pursue their march to Ariminum (p. 48). But, if the Othonians were still south of the Po, this danger would not be incurred, if they were already north of the Po, the Vitellians could have no possible motive in marching to Ariminum.

But Mr. Henderson's main object of illustrating these campaigns by modern strategy is inextricably mixed up with another. Tacitus did not realise these strategical principles, and besides, Tacitus has been 'for all time' labelled by Mommsen as 'the most unmilitary of historians.' Accordingly, a great deal of Mr. Henderson's work, though mostly in the first chapter, is taken up with criticising the blindness, short-sightedness, shallowness, and incapacity of Tacitus in matters military. I have found it impossible within the limits of a review to do justice to this subject, and I have therefore dealt with it more fully in an article in the *Journal of Philology* (Vol. xxxi, No. 61). But no review of the book can leave quite untouched the most original, the most brilliant, but also the most untenable of his theories, the explanation of the first 'Battle of Bedriacum.'

Now ev  
Plutarch, po  
Hist. ii. 40  
Mr. Henders  
absolutely n  
ceived the b  
be made the  
the north of  
the Adua, t  
'simultaneou  
Cremona wo  
the lines on

1. Was  
which any  
(p. 111), ad  
immobility  
the express  
watching for

2. Is th  
army, on w  
strategic en  
is absolutely

Mr. H  
abandoned.  
of the schen  
'ad quartun  
miles distan  
that they, v  
who would  
and were a  
is not prom  
the figures,  
but wholly  
decimum' (C  
Henderson  
mile extra  
a complete  
(pp. 116 and  
have come  
misundersto  
theory can  
the *Journal*  
to substitut

Now every word, I think I may say without exception, in Tacitus and Plutarch, points to a reckless frontal attack, except the well-known crux in Hist. ii. 40 'confluentes Padi et Aduae fluminum—petebant.' On these words Mr. Henderson builds his theory. Otho, of whose military capacity we know absolutely nothing except from his supposed action in the present case, conceived the brilliant idea of a strategical envelopment of Cremona, which was to be made the Metæ of the campaign. The Bedriacum force was to pass round the north of Cremona by a close flanking movement, and reach the mouth of the Adua, thus cutting communications with Gaul. At the same time, by a 'simultaneous movement' the Danube army was to occupy Bedriacum, so that Cremona would be enveloped and forced to capitulate. I can here only indicate the lines on which this theory must be tested.

1. Was this flank march, considering the numbers on the two sides, one which any sane general could have contemplated? Mr. Henderson himself (p. 111), admits that 'all depended on the immobility of the enemy.' This immobility he assumes, contrary to all probability, and in utter disregard of the express statement of Tacitus, that the Vitellians were keenly alert and watching for the first false move (ii. 34).

2. Is there any evidence for the simultaneous movement of the Danube army, on which, as Mr. Henderson again admits (p. 106), 'the whole idea of strategic envelopment depended'? I have tried to show elsewhere that there is absolutely none. If so, the whole theory falls like a house of cards.

Mr. Henderson admits that the idea was for one reason or another abandoned. But he makes a very ingenious attempt to find the initial stages of the scheme in Tacitus. According to Tacitus, the Othonians first encamped 'ad quartum a Bedriaco.' Next day, they started for the confluence, sixteen miles distant, in spite of the objections of Paulinus, who urged the certainty that they, weary with so long a march, would be attacked by the Vitellians, who would have barely four miles to traverse (ii. 40). They started however, and were attacked on the Postumian road, a few miles from Cremona. This is not promising material out of which to get the great flank movement, and the figures, 4, 16, and 4 cannot all stand. Mr. Henderson adopts the heroic, but wholly illegitimate course of altering 'ad quartum' into 'ad quartum decimum' (p. 345). From this point, the confluence is fifteen miles, but Mr. Henderson gets the sixteen by allowing the quite impossible margin of one mile extra for the flank march. The four miles of Paulinus are explained by a complete distortion and misrepresentation of what Tacitus makes him urge (pp. 116 and 345). The flank march is abandoned, partly because the Othonians have come too far along the road, partly because Otho's final orders are misunderstood. It seems to me that by methods of interpretation like this any theory can be proved or disproved. The suggestion which I make myself in the *Journal of Philology* is to read 'Hadrae' (the modern Arda) for 'Aduae,' and to substitute for the 'ad quartum' of Tacitus the fifty stades of Plutarch, a

preference for which there is some reason. With these two changes, all the other figures, the sixteen miles of Tacitus, the one hundred stades of Plutarch, and the four miles of Paulinus sufficiently well fit in. It is true that the matter resolves itself into a frontal attack, but the word 'Aduae' is the single obstacle to such a view, which is otherwise strongly supported by both Plutarch and Tacitus.

Of Mr. Henderson's three chapters, the first is perhaps the most interesting and the most exciting, because it is the most controversial. In the last two chapters Mr. Henderson is content, with some few exceptions, to follow the general guidance of Tacitus, filling up gaps and explaining obscurities with an acuteness and lucidity which make his work an invaluable 'Companion to the Histories.' But the very excellence of these chapters should, I think, make us hesitate before accepting Mommsen's exaggerated epigram that Tacitus is the most unmilitary of historians. Whether he was too fond of following camp gossip, as Mr. Henderson suggests, is a wide question, and requires more discussion than he gives to it.

At the close of his book, and in connection with 'the results in the Roman army,' arising from the troubles in Gaul and Germany, Mr. Henderson touches upon the fringe of two important questions,

1. The recruiting system for the Legions, and
2. The employment of 'Clan Regiments.'

He is well qualified to deal with both these subjects thoroughly, and I wish that he would do so, but his remarks here are not as clear or as free from misunderstanding as could be desired.

1. In the first place, he commits himself to the following, as it seems to me, astounding statement. 'The Emperor Augustus had sought to establish the general practice that recruits for legions serving in the Western part of the Empire should be drawn from the Eastern Provinces, and that legions on duty in the latter should be recruited from the West' (p. 324). This sweeping and, as far as I know, original statement is not supported by a single reference. I can only point out very briefly one or two objections to it. It is wholly opposed to the conclusions arrived at by Mommsen in his well-known article on the subject, in *Hermes* xix. All the epigraphic evidence collected there, as well as several passages from the *Annals*, point to exactly the opposite practice. The Eastern legions were recruited from the East, the Western from the West, while those of Moesia seem to have been raised from both. Mr. Henderson may say that Augustus was unable to carry his policy into effect. But it was from the first an obviously impossible policy, which Augustus could never have thought of. There were only six Eastern Legions and, omitting the Moesian, fifteen or sixteen in the West. Even for the six legions, there were not enough Roman citizens in the East to recruit them in the ordinary way, and in consequence the Eastern legions were very largely 'vernaculae,' i.e. composed of Orientals, who up to the time of enlistment were 'peregrini.' Is it conceivable

that Augustus  
for the Rhine

Again,  
German Legions  
territorial s  
camps invo  
children of  
so closely t  
As a resul  
German sy  
system, I h  
the view th  
legionaries  
Vespasian,  
is there any  
sympathies.  
their disloy  
feelings of  
vel externu  
end, it was  
his German  
service in a  
are example  
legions. It  
war as to th  
'in the sys  
made any c

2. With  
an importan  
the need fo  
well as som  
armies. Th  
practice of  
Vespasian, a  
and Gallic  
Mr. Hender  
auxiliaries  
were usuall  
levies, I rat  
ing of the  
as he could  
curator of F  
distinguish

that Augustus could ever have contemplated a 'vernacular' army of this kind for the Rhine, the Danube, and Spain?

Again, Mr. Henderson explains the mutinous and disloyal behaviour of the German Legions in the year 69 by what he calls 'the introduction of the territorial system' into the army. He believes that the system of permanent camps involved recruiting from 'the children of the Legion,' and even from the children of the auxiliaries, and that 'so a legion and a locality became identified so closely that the interests and hopes of the latter became those of the former.' As a result, 'the legions on the Rhine in A.D. 69 were tainted with native German sympathies' (pp. 323 and 325). Now, with regard to the territorial system, I believe I am right in saying that epigraphic evidence is all against the view that strictly local recruiting was earlier than Hadrian. The German legionaries came from Gaul, especially Narbonensis, Spain, Noricum, and up to Vespasian, from Italy. Nor, though the circumstances were wholly exceptional, is there any evidence that the legions on the Rhine were tainted with German sympathies. Their mutinous conduct was due to the licence of civil war, while their disloyalty was either due to absolute compulsion, or again to the bitter feelings of civil strife. They were Vitellian legions, and 'Vitellianae legiones vel externum servitium quam imperatorem Vespasianum malle' (iv. 54). In the end, it was to the Gallic Empire that they swore allegiance, not to Civilis and his Germans. I make bold to say that there is no evidence whatever that long service in a province, whether Britain or Spain or Germany or Africa, and there are examples of it in all these, was the cause of danger or disloyalty among the legions. It is surely a somewhat lame conclusion to the lesson learnt in this war as to the dangers of the recruiting system, that Mr. Henderson has to admit, 'in the system of recruiting for the legions, Vespasian is not known to have made any change.'

2. With regard to the auxiliary troops along the Rhine, Vespasian did make an important change, and Mr. Henderson explains very clearly what it was, and the need for it (p. 329). A considerable number of Gallic cohorts and alae as well as some drawn from German tribes were employed in both the German armies. The possible dangers of this are obvious, and were increased by the practice of putting these corps under the command of their own countrymen. Vespasian, as Mr. Henderson shows, with a few exceptions, removed these German and Gallic auxiliaries to other provinces, further from their own homes. But if Mr. Henderson implies by his phrase, 'the practice of using clan regiments for auxiliaries in their native country,' that the auxilia generally up to this time were usually so posted, or that they may be collectively described as 'local levies,' I rather demur to this view. I notice that, e.g., Mr. Henderson in speaking of the procurator of Raetia says: 'his only troops were such native levies as he could raise in case of sudden peril' (p. 29). On the contrary, the procurator of Raetia had a considerable force of auxiliary cohorts and alae, carefully distinguished in ii. 68 from the native levies: 'Raeticae alae cohortesque et ipsorum

Raetorum iuventus.' Does Mr. Henderson suppose that these *alae* and cohorts were all composed of Raeti, or that the nineteen cohorts and five *alae* in the Mauretanian provinces (ii. 52) were all composed of Mauretanian tribesmen, or that the auxiliaries of Noricum were all native levies, as is implied on page 162? We have unfortunately no 'diplomata' for the prae-Flavian period, but even in the Rhine army we have enough information to know that it was not the rule there to employ clan regiments in their own homes. The Batavian cohorts were at this time not part of the German army at all, but of the British. When they did belong to the German army they were stationed in Upper, not in Lower Germany. Belgae too are found in the upper army, Treveri on the Lower Rhine. Again, cohorts of Raeti, Thracians, Vascones, Britons, and of other tribes from more distant provinces are found in the Rhine armies, just as Gallic cohorts and *alae* are found in Britain and Pannonia. From the first, Tacitus tells us, (*Ann.* iv. 5.) the *auxilia* moved about from province to province more frequently than the legions, a statement quite inconsistent with the theory that they were all this time merely local levies.

Whether Mommsen is right in holding that in course of time the auxiliary soldiers 'served without distinction as to their descent in the most various divisions,' or whether, according to Mr. Henderson, the clan regiments 'presumably continued to be composed, at least largely (? entirely), of the natives of those tribes whose names they bear,' is a question which can only be decided by a careful examination of diplomata and other inscriptions. My impression is that Mommsen does not speak without book, but perhaps Mr. Henderson has collected counter evidence. The clan names prove no more than such a cognomen as 'Gallica' applied to a Syrian legion.

Among minor points, I would notice the following. On page 32 we are told that there were 'nine cohorts of Praetorian Guards, and seven of Urban Guards.' This implies that the increase made by Claudius affected the urban cohorts only, and not the praetorian. It is not the ordinary view, nor, I think, in accordance with the evidence. At any rate, Mr. Henderson must be wrong in saying, page 34, 'Under Tiberius, Cohors XVII is in garrison at Lugdunum.' At that time, it must have been cohorts XIII.

It appears from ii. 57, that Vitellius was joined before entering Italy by eight thousand troops from Britain. Mr. Henderson on p. 166 supposes that in response to an appeal from Vitellius, further detachments were sent 'in time to take part in the struggle.' This is a mistake. The 'Vexillarii trium Britannicarum legionum,' in ii. 100, are clearly those led into Italy by Vitellius himself.

On page 214 Mr. Henderson supposes that the *legio* II Adjutrix which 'was formally enrolled by Mucianus,' was formed from the '*legio e classicis*,' a body of marines collected by Vitellius from the Misenum fleet (iii. 55). This is of course possible, but I would suggest as far more probable that it was formed from the '*classici* Ravennates legionariam militiam poscentes,' who

joined the  
distinct  
legion sl  
On  
Germ. 21  
populi.'

On  
'fell upon  
does not  
compelle  
not a ca  
appealed  
camp, wh  
says that  
(iv. 61).

Of s  
footnote  
on page  
I on  
Messrs. M  
which I

joined the army of Antonius (iii. 50). In that case, the promotion would be a distinct reward of service rendered. There seems no reason why the Vitellian legion should be so honoured.

On page 256 Mr. Henderson says, 'the Nemetes were Gauls.' Tacitus, *Germ.* 28, classes them among the tribes which were 'haud dubie Germanorum populi.'

On page 288 Mr. Henderson says that Tutor, after the death of Vocula, 'fell upon Cologne and Mainz, and took them both without trouble.' Tacitus does not say that he took either place. He says that he surrounded them, and compelled them to acknowledge the Gallic empire (iv. 59). Cologne was clearly not a captured city when it negotiated with the Tencteri (iv. 64), or when it appealed for the help of Cerealis (iv. 79). Mainz was as clearly not a captured camp, when the Ala Picentina took refuge there (iv. 62), while Tacitus expressly says that Mogontiacum and Vindonissa were not burnt with the other camps (iv. 61).

Of slips or misprints, I have only noticed two. Legio I. Italica is in a footnote on page 167 mentioned as one of the legions of Lower Germany, while on page 278 Novaesium is described as 'north' of Vetera.

I only wish that all books were printed in the large clear type in which Messrs. Macmillan have presented Mr. Henderson's work. It is the only book which I have been able to read through myself during the past three years.

E. G. HARDY.



### BIANCA BRUNO'S *THIRD SAMNITE WAR*.

BIANCA BRUNO, *La terza guerra Sannitica*, (*Studi di storia antica*, pubblicati da Giulio Beloch, fascicolo vi.). Rome: Loescher, 1906. Pp. 122. Lire 5.50.

THE book before us is a careful history of the Third Samnite War and the few years immediately preceding it (304-290 B.C.). The only continuous narrative of this war is Livy ix. 45 to end, x., and *Per.* xi., so that the book practically resolves itself into an analysis of the Livian account, as presented in Livy himself and the epitomists. Outside Livy the only sources available are the epitaph of Scipio Barbatus (*C.I.L.* i. p. 16), a few incidental notices in Frontinus, Valerius Maximus, and the *de uiris illustribus*, a sentence or two in Pliny, Cicero, etc., and the *Fasti Triumphales*. The writer shows a very keen eye for any fragment of evidence which may be used to correct or to fill up the Livian narrative. To a certain extent the *Fasti Triumphales* are valuable in this respect; they sometimes give help towards discarding some of the grosser inconsistencies of Livy. Unfortunately they are not much nearer the truth, dating as they do from 12 B.C. They reflect the same tendencies as Livy's narrative; exaggeration, glorification of self, family and country have played havoc with dull fact; one would hesitate to say that they drew from sources purer than, or even different from those available to Livy.

Thus for her main theory Bianca Bruno relies on such few and faint glimpses of an older and truer version as may be caught sight of through the thick overlay of annalistic tradition. This theory may be shortly stated: in very early historical accounts there was a constant verbal confusion between *Sabini* and *Samnites*; the greater importance of the conflict with the Samnites almost completely obscured that with the Sabines; a true reconstruction of the Third Samnite war would make the Sabines very prominent; in fact, it is by no means certain that they did not begin the war, yet, owing largely to the verbal confusion mentioned, their action as enemies of Rome only appears late in the war, and then obscurely, e.g. in Liv. *Per.* xi., Oros. iii. 22, 11, Flor. i. 15, *auctor de uir illustr.* 33. 3 (*M. Curius Dentatus*), Cic. *Cato m.* 16, 55; Apul. *de mag.* 17. The supposition that the hostility of the Sabines to Rome should be thrown back to the beginning of the war, is attractive and seems to have grown from the author's thorough examination of the sources, not to have been preconceived and then propped up by selected quotations. Perhaps she shows a tendency to work her idea rather hard, but on the whole it presents itself as a very reasonable solution of many difficulties in the Livian narrative.

As she notes  
connection  
attacking R  
Moreover, if  
it is easier to  
they must  
Second Sam  
blow for fro  
Perhaps  
problem ro  
the risk of  
other critic  
summed up  
There

As she notes, the geographical position of the Sabines would ensure the necessary connection between the war in the north, where Gauls and Etruscans were attacking Rome, and that in the south, where the Samnites were fighting. Moreover, if the initiative in forcing on this war is attributed to the Sabines, it is easier to understand how the Samnites came to break the peace of 304 B.C.; they must have been greatly exhausted by the tremendous struggle of the Second Samnite War, but could not resist the temptation of striking one more blow for freedom when another nation gave the signal.

Perhaps even the writer would not claim that her book had finally solved the problem round which it centres; such reconstructions of ancient narrative run the risk of being discarded, as soon as a newer or better idea occurs to some other critic. For the sake of clearness we could have wished that she had summed up her results more definitely at the end of each chapter.

There is an appendix on the chronology of Polybius during the Gallic wars.

LOUISE E. MATTHAEI.

## A SKETCH BOOK OF ANCIENT ROME (OF THE SCHOOL OF DOMENICO GHIRLANDAIO).

*Codex Escorialensis, ein Skizzenbuch aus der Werkstatt Domenico Ghirlandaio's,*  
unter Mitwirkung von CHRISTIAN HÜLSEN und ADOLF MICHAELIS, heraus-  
gegeben von HERMANN EGGER. (Sonderschriften des oesterr. archäol.  
Instituts in Wien, iv. 1906.) 2 vols. 4to. I. Text: 174 pp. with 3 plates  
and 70 illustrations in the text. II. Plates: 70 plates with 137 illustrations.

THE publication in facsimile of the more important drawings of Renaissance artists which have relation to the antiquities of Rome has been one of the features of the study of Roman archaeology and topography in recent years. It is in this manner that *rapprochements* can best be made between these various drawings, which are scattered over the museums and libraries of Europe, and the monuments which they represent, and the perusal of such a work as Prof. Hülsen's concluding volume of Jordan's *Topographie der Stadt Rom* (C.R. 1908, 154 sqq.) will show the utility of such publications, while their interest as showing the development of these artists themselves, and informing us what were the objects of their study, is no less great. Among them, that of the book of drawings attributed to Andreas Coner in the Soane Museum (*Papers of the British School at Rome*, ii. (1904)) by the present writer, brought before the public a series hitherto unknown. That the attribution, though only put forward tentatively, is impossible, has been demonstrated to my satisfaction by Herr Egger himself in a review in *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* (Beiblatt der Mitteilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforschung, 1906, No. 3). Coner, as the inventory of his books shows, was a priest and a considerable scholar, to whom the numerous errors in the Latinity of the text to the drawings themselves cannot be attributed. It seems also clear that Herr Egger is correct in his statement that the drawings, as we have them, are not originals (neither those of the first nor of the second hand), but go back to older collections. This is indicated by the fact that several of the plans and profiles are to be found in other contemporary collections of drawings, e.g. the Codex Barberinianus of Giuliano da Sangallo, so closely resembling those of the so-called Coner as to indicate their derivation from a common archetype, and by the incorrect copying of some of the legends, obviously by one who did not understand them, which makes it difficult to suppose that this was itself the archetype.

I have referred to these points, because the case in regard to the Codex

Escorialen  
similar inc  
sons, dem  
some of t  
sketches o  
(That Mic  
unsuccessf  
ing point.  
is not a s

The  
some of t  
the autho  
date of th  
ornamenta  
drawings,  
most imp  
from abou  
drawn by  
published

The  
Egger hir  
with thos  
views of  
specialists  
sections i  
the drawi  
The draw  
numerous  
to those  
especially

Fol. 7

r

d

J

Fol.

C

a

v

Fol.

l

s

l

f

Escorialensis is identical. There, too, the draughtsman is only a copyist, as similar indications show. Herr Egger has, by a series of very careful comparisons, demonstrated that he was a scholar of Domenico Ghirlandaio, and that some of the originals he copied were probably the architectural drawings and sketches of buildings made at Rome, as Vasari tells us, by his master (pp. 35 *sqq.*). (That Michelangelo, as Condivi tells us in a passage cited by Herr Egger, unsuccessfully (*sic*) attempted to borrow Domenico's sketch-book, is an interesting point.) His identity cannot, however, be more closely determined, as there is not a single independent conception by him in the whole book (p. 47).

The drawings of plans, and details of architecture and ornamentation and some of those of ancient sculptures, are equally taken from older pattern-books, the authorship of which it has not as yet been possible to determine. The date of the sketch-book itself is not earlier than 1491, the year given on an ornamental pilaster on f. 50v. It is thus some 25 years earlier than the Coner drawings, and is almost the first of its kind which has come down to us. The most important drawings in it are, undoubtedly, the views of Rome, which date from about this period, and are especially interesting in comparison with those drawn by Heemskerck some 40 years later. Some of them have been already published separately by Müntz and Hülsen.

The drawings are, from p. 57 onwards, carefully described in detail—Herr Egger himself, who is entirely responsible for the introduction (pp. 5–56) dealing with those of architectural or artistic interest, Prof. Hülsen with many of the views of Rome, Prof. Michaelis with the sculptures. The combination of specialists is indeed a fortunate one, and the responsibility for the respective sections is clearly apportioned in a table at the end, which also shows when the drawing is taken from another drawing, and when direct from the original. The drawings themselves are fully reproduced in vol. ii., while in vol. i. we find numerous illustrations from other drawings or engravings which form parallels to those of the codex under notice. We may note the following as more especially interesting:

*Fol. 7.* The view of the interior of the mausoleum of Constantia (S. Costanza near S. Agnese), with its decorations as they were before the restoration of 1620—in the lower zone marble intarsia like that of the basilica of Junius Bassus.

*Fol. 7 v., 8.* Panorama of Rome from Monte Mario, especially interesting in comparison with the later panoramas from the same point by Heemskerck and Wyngaerde. The battlemented tower in front of the Hospital of S. Spirito cannot be satisfactorily identified. The representation of the Vatican palace is interesting.

*Fol. 10.* A detail from the so-called 'volta dorata,' a ceiling in the Golden House of Nero, which formed the subject of a fine coloured drawing by Francesco d'Olanda (reproduced on Pl. III. of the text volume), whose sketch-book in the Escorial will, we may hope, one day also be published by Herr Egger. Other details of ceilings from the Golden House follow.

- Fol. 15 v.* has a drawing of a sarcophagus in the church of the SS. Apostoli, with a representation of sea deities, which has since disappeared, and is otherwise unknown.
- Fol. 23 (3).* I do not think the identification of this base with that of the columns of the portico of S. Venanzio at the Lateran baptistery is correct. See Coner (so called), fol. 132 (a).
- Fol. 26 v.* Interesting view of the castle and bridge of S. Angelo before the alterations of Alexander VI. (1492-5). There is another view of the castle on f. 30 v.
- Fol. 27 v.* View of the Pons Fabricius and the Tiber island. It is noticeable that this and the last view recur identically in the Codex Barberinianus at Giuliano da Sangallo (f. 34 v) in such a way that a common original for both must be supposed. Figs. 68, 70, inserted at the end of the text volume, and giving two different views of the same bridge from engravings by Willem van Nieulandt in my collection, form further interesting parallels.
- Fol. 35.* Elevation of the apse of SS. Cosma and Damiano, with its original marble incrustation, destroyed probably in 1632.
- Fol. 40 v.* View from the northern summit of the Capitol over the eastern portion of the city, with the mediaeval Tor dei Conti in the centre, reproduced on a larger scale in the text volume, pl. iv.
- Fol. 41 v.* View of the Colosseum, absolutely identical with a drawing in the Soane Museum (vol. marked 'Margaret Chinnery,' fol. 28). A similar identity is to be noted between fol. 29 of the Cod. Escorialensis and f. 6 of the vol. marked 'Margaret Chinnery.'
- Fol. 48.* Elevation of the Tomb of Bibulus. That in the so-called Coner sketch-book is by the second hand.
- Fol. 53.* Drawing of the Apollo Belvedere, the oldest we have. The text informs us that it then stood in the garden of S. Pietro in Vincoli. Michaelis succeeds in disproving Hülsen's theory that it was found near Marino. Another drawing is on fol. 64, and Michaelis decides from an examination of them that the incorrect restoration of the lower part of the right arm, which already appears here, dates from classical times.
- Fol. 56.* Lower part of a statue of Jupiter in the collection of Giovanni Ciampolini, one of the earliest formed in Rome. Michaelis has succeeded in recognizing the torso in the Naples Museum.
- Fol. 56 v.* (reproduced on a larger scale in Pl. V. of the text volume). View of Rome from the Aventine.
- Fol. 60.* Part of a ceiling in the Golden House of Nero—plan only of the compartments. This is more fully represented in Cod. Windsor H. 22 (Vittoria) f. 20 (21 Lanciani) and Bellori-Bartoli, *Picturae Antiquae, Animadversiones in Appendicem*, tab. v., as I discovered this summer.

It will be recognized from this short account that the publication is one of the highest importance, and it is good to know that others will follow it. The Vatican Library, which in 1902 acquired the Barberini Library *en bloc*, is

about to p  
by Prof. H  
publish th  
have alrea  
tions as a  
hopes to b  
of this co  
collection  
Alessandro  
Windsor—  
consent.

about to publish the drawings of Giuliano da Sangallo in facsimile, with text by Prof. Hülsen, and there are grounds for hoping that Herr Egger will shortly publish the Heemskerck sketch-books in Berlin. Isolated drawings from these have already appeared in various articles and books, but the issue of the collections as a whole will be of great interest. The British School at Rome, too, hopes to bear its part in making known the treasures which exist in the libraries of this country, and I am now engaged in the formation of a catalogue of the collection of drawings begun by Cassiano dal Pozzo, and purchased from Cardinal Alessandro Albani by George III., which are now in the Royal Library at Windsor—an enterprise for which H.M. the King has graciously given his consent.

THOMAS ASHBY.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

Rheinisches Museum, etc. 63. 4. 1908.

S. Sudhaus, *Die Abfassungszeit des Alexandra*. The last twelve lines bear out the date suggested by Beloch and Skutsch: 1446 *sqq.* refer to Flamininus and Cynoscephalae. A. v. Mess, *Das 68 Gedicht Catulls*. Allius asks Catullus to send him love poetry of his own composition which will console him and help to reconcile his mistress to him. This last thought is an elegiac *tóros*. H. Raeder, *Alkidamas und Platon als Gegner des Isokrates*. 1. Against Gercke's article, *Rh. Mus.* 62. 171 *sqq.* His interpretation of Alc. 4 and Isocr. 13. 9-12 quite mistaken: it is Isocrates, not an 'old *τέχνη*' that Alc. is attacking. 2. Gompertz wrong in thinking that Isocrates' Cyprian speeches and *Busiris* display a tone friendly to Plato. H. Rabe, *Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften*. 1. Further sources for the text of Johannes Diaconus. 2. Georgius' commentary on Hermogenes' *oráous*: two chapters edited with critical apparatus based on Py, Ya, Vy. 3. A Madrid MS., once the property of Const. Lascaris, and containing extracts from Christophorus' commentary. L. Radermacher, *Motiv und Persönlichkeit*. 2. Vergil's description of the punishments in Hell. In general, the penalties in Hell are the outcome of popular legend and humour: they were not originally connected with particular individuals such as Sisyphus and Tantalus. In the oldest tradition we find the task of pouring water into leaky vessels assigned to unnamed maidens: its becoming the peculiar penalty of the Danaids is connected with the fact that in folklore eternal water-carrying is the duty of the *ἄγαιες*. No need then to decide exactly where in *Aen.* 6. 608 *sqq.* the transition from ordinary mortal sinners to mythical ones takes place. R. M. E. Meister, *Eideshelfer im griech. Rechte*. Passages from Aristotle, Gortynian Insc., etc., which suggest the existence of persons who confirmed the oaths of the parties to the suit by an oath based on knowledge not of the facts involved, but of the characters of the parties. A. Dyroff, *Caesars Anticato und Ciceros Cato*. Caesar's work described Cato as a man in whom all the Stoic virtues were distorted. Influence of Cicero's work upon Valerius Maximus and in particular Seneca. The Cato poems of the *Poetae Lat. Minores*. R. Reitzenstein, *Die Inselfahrt der Ciris*. The Vergil lines 473-4 and 476. Difficulties arise in the matter (for Minos had no object in seeking Delos) and style (*linguitur* and the *que*'s in 476) at the very moment at which the narrative becomes Vergilian. A. Brinkmann, *Die Homer-Metaphrasen des Prokopius von Gaza*. The thought of Homer M. 322 *sqq.* paraphrased in an anonymous writer in Iamblichus, pseudo-Lysias, Theopompus, Cicero, Lesbonax, Procopius and Nicolaus Cabasilas. *Miscellen*: T. Gompertz, *Zu Herodot.* 2. 16. Read *ἡ γὰρ δὴ for οὐ γὰρ δὴ*. Idem, *War Archimedes von königl. Geblüte?* Explains Plutarch's *τῷ βασιλεῖ συγγενὴς* (*Vit. Marc.* 14. 7) as a title of rank. J. M. Stahl, *Zu Fragmenten des Euripides*. Emendations of Euripides fragments published by Rabe, *Rh. Mus.* 1908, 127 *sqq.* (esp. from *Bellerophon*). R. Asmus, *Zur Textkritik von Julian. Or. IV.* A. Brinkmann, *Zu Julians IV Rede*. G. Némethy, *Tibulliana*. 1. 6. 56 *admittas* is used in its regular amatory sense; 2. 2. 7 *Syrio* to be read for *puro*; 2. 3. 71-72: cp. *Lucr.* 5. 962. C. Huelsen, *Ein Vers des Martial und eine stadtrömische Grabschrift*. Confirms Housman's

note on Mart.  
to be the epitaph  
K. Meiser, *Zu*  
means 'water'  
a constant ep  
king was inve  
got their name  
*Stücke mit Sc*

Neue Ja

J. Ilberg  
the relations  
*Medicorum*.  
im *Altertum*.  
The hypotheses  
2. Earthquake  
world. ? Soc  
*Mitteilungen*:  
*Judentum und*  
erudition and

21. 10.

E. Weber  
and difference  
and Cyrus aff  
M. Wellmann  
account of f  
*Die Vorträge*  
Professional  
P. Simon, *Zu*  
*griech. Apolo*  
to his work

23. I. 1

W. Nestle  
2. Chr. The  
of the influ  
foundation  
Antiphon, e  
Of these, o  
weak and n  
extent Socra  
superior min  
Chalcedon.  
(esp. Critias  
*Epode und*  
*niger*: the  
prophet for  
Ll. 49, 50  
that the Ep



note on Mart. 3. 93. 20 (*Class. Rev.* 1908, p. 46) from *C.I.L.* vi. 9590, which he believes to be the epitaph of this long-lived lady's doctor: C · MATTIO · LYGDAMO · MEDICO · SATTIAE. K. Meiser, *Zu Juvenal* 15. 90. Read *audi* for *autem*. H. Ehrlich, *König Ogyges*. 'Ὠγύγιος means 'watery': the Attic king an invention to explain Ὠγύγια κατὰ ('the Deluge'): as a constant epithet of Ἐρυγὸς Ἰδωρ the word came to mean 'chthonic' and the Boeotian king was invented in conn. with the Ogygian gate, grove and hill at Thebes which really got their name from the Furies who were worshipped there as Ὠγύγαι νῆμφαι. E. Nestle, *Stücke mit Schlangenhaut*. A. Elter, *Zusatz zu o. S.* 472.

# Neue Jahrbücher für das klassische Altertum, etc. 21. 9. 1908.

J. Ilberg, *Die Erforschung der griech. Heilkunde*. Some account of the history of the relations between Philology and Medicine, in connexion with the new *Corpus Medicorum*. Soranus. Hints for a history of ancient Medicine. W. Capelle, *Erdbeben im Altertum*. 1. Earthquakes in Greece: the connexion of the Poseidon cult therewith. The hypotheses of ancient scientists, esp. Democritus, Anaxagoras, Aristotle and Posidonius. 2. Earthquakes in Italy. Roman superstition. 3. Earthquakes in other parts of the world. ?Sodom and Gomorrha. R. Asmus, *Eichendorffs 'Julian'*. *Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: Wendland's *Die hellenistisch-römische Kultur in ihren Beziehungen zum Judentum und Christentum* reviewed by Zielinski. 'All that great power, wide-read erudition and sure judgment could do for such a theme.'

21. 10. 1908.

E. Weber, *Herodot als Dichter*. Epic breadth of the historian, points of similarity and difference between him and Homer. Comp. of the conversation between Croesus and Cyrus after the release from the pyre with that of Priam and Achilles in *Il.* 22. 372 sqq. M. Wellmann, *Asklepiades aus Bithynien von einem herrschenden Vorurtheil befreit*. Pliny's account of him as a charlatan unreliable. Account of his physiology. B. Warnecke, *Die Vortragskunst der römischen Schauspieler*. Strength of voice not helped by the masks. Professional voice-training. Many hints to be found in Quint. and the Terence-scholia. P. Simon, *Die Huldigung der Kunst*. *Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: J. Geffcken's *Zwei griech. Apologeten* reviewed by P. Wendland. 'G. has done a great service. . . I owe to his work most valuable suggestions.'

23. 1. 1909.

W. Nestle, *Politik und Aufklärung in Griechenland im Ausgang des V Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* The pseudo-Xenophonic 'State of the Athenians' the first attempt at an examination of the influence of natural laws upon forms of constitution. The Sophists laid the foundation of a theory of Political Science, but whereas the views of Protagoras, Antiphon, etc., were not revolutionary, those of the adherents of Natural Law were. Of these, one section (Hippias, Lycophron, Alcidas) pleaded for the majority of weak and needy persons, the other (Thrasymachus and Callicles in Plato, and to some extent Socrates) regard law as protecting an inferior majority against an intellectually superior minority. Sketches of ideal states by Hippodamus of Miletus and Phaleas of Chalcedon. Results of these theories: the oligarchic revolution of 411, the thirty tyrants (esp. Critias), the deaths of Theramenes and Socrates, Caesarism. F. Skutsch, *Sechzehnte Epode und vierte Ekloge*. Ll. 13 sqq. refer to the burial of Romulus and the *lapis niger*: the conception is illustrated by a passage of Julius Valerius (3. 57) in which a prophet foretells that the city in which Alexander is buried will endure for ever. Ll. 49, 50 and 33 closely resemble Verg. *Ecl.* 4. 21, 22: the latter is the imitator, so that the Epode may be dated between 42 B.C. and 40 B.C., and we need assume no

allusion to *Carm. Sibyll.* 3. 790 sqq. A Müller, *Das Bühnenwesen in der Zeit von Constantin d. Gr. bis Justinian*. Deals mainly with mimes and pantomimes, the life and status of the players. R. M. Meyer, *Die Methode der wechselseitigen Erhellung. Anzeigen und Mitteilungen*: K. Dissel, *Der Sperling der Lesbia. Passer solitarius*, not *p. domesticus*: στροβίον ποτόγον of Psalm 102 is rendered in the Vulgate *passer solitarius*, and the latter name may have been current in Catullus' time. T. Plüss, *Ein Vorschlag zu Donarem pateras*. Maintains the genuineness, with explanations of the difficulties (e.g. officially the burning of Carthage was due to that city's breach of the treaty made by the elder Africanus, *lucratus nomina*: 'gaining no personal advantage'). Zieliński's *Cicero im Wandel der Jahrhunderte* summarised and favourably noticed by E. Grünwald.

#### Archiv für lat. Lexikographie, etc. 15. 4. 1908.

Oskar Hey, *Wortgeschichtliche Beobachtungen*. The use of *ut ita dicam*, mainly in Cicero, where it accompanies (a) new words, (b) new meanings, (c) *uerba humilia*, (d) oxymoron. Idem, *Zur Assimilation von ct. Coatores* in Corpus 5. 4504, 4505. N. Vulić, *Redire, reuertit, reducem esse*. In Spartian's *Vita Hadr.* 1. 3 *ad patriam redit* the verb is used of a person returning to the country which he has never seen before; so *reduces* in Verg. *Aen.* 3. 96. Th. Bügel, *Ein Fall seltener Tmesis*. In the case of compounds of the form *pseudo-apostoli*, *ps.-christiani*, and compounds of *de*, tmesis was permissible in the time of Ambrosiaster and Verecundus. S. Brassloff, *Ueber den Gebrauch von proinde und perinde bei den klass. Juristen*. Generally, *proinde* is 'therefore,' *perinde* 'according as': occasionally the meanings are interchanged. In *Dig.* 42. 1. 57 *proinde* appears to have neither meaning, but the passage wants rearranging and it is easy to do this in such a way that the particle has its usual force. But in seven passages of the *Digest* where *perinde* = *deinde* there is good reason to believe the presence of interpolation (by Justinian). P. Rasi, *Manere = esse*. A. Klotz, *Incessare*. Eutyches cites it from Statius 11. 361, where QNqfrb present it. In view, however, of the poet's classicist principles, it is not likely that he used the word. Idem, *Die Statiusscholien*. The first Statius commentaries came into existence about 400. About 550 Lactantius Placidus used these for his work on the poets which lasted until Carolingian times, when it was broken up into marginal scholia. These again were collected and written out continuously without the text in Monac. 19482 and the two Parisini 8063, 8064. The scholia enable us to form some idea of the individuality of Lactantius (e.g. traces of rhythmical *clausulae*, attention given to subject matter rather than grammatico-rhetorical points, interested in Philosophy; especially the *pars naturalis*). L. Havet, *Armatus, Bewaffnung*. No Ciceronian ex. in Thesaurus: but see *Caec.* 61. P. Rasi, *Vomi Perfectform von vomere?* Evidence for *euomisse* in *Carmen de Pascha* 52 H, supporting *uomerit* in Fronto p. 141 N. K. E. Götz, *Waren die Römer blaublind?* (continued from vol. 14). Discusses *caeruleus*, *aerius*, *thalassicus*, *uenetus*, *caesius*, *lividus*, *glauco*, *cyaneus*, *hyacinthinus*. The Romans had a perfectly clear conception of the colour. W. Heraeus, *Obrio und obro*. Evidence from Chiron's *Mulomedicina*, etc. Idem, *Glando*. In Gell. iv 1. 8 *glandem* and *glande* of the MSS. may be a trace of this word (found thrice in verse). Idem, *Zur sogenannten Peregrinatio Siluiae*. Emendations and stylistic notes: accusative for nom. (said by Mohl to be the surest characteristic of Spanish Latin) in 25. 3. 27. 1 (*orationem, septimanas, unum*), vulgarisms, redundancies. Idem, *Crept(a)tura. Crepturas* the reading in Schol. Iuu. 3. 196. Idem, *Uter, utris* Iuuenius 2. 373 *utribus*. Idem, *Der Akkusativ nach memor, nescius und Lacernobirrus*. The Editor, *Zu den lat. Spruchweisen*. Influence of Euripides and Menander on Pubilius Syrus. Relation between him and 'Caecilius de nugis philosophorum.' C. Weyman, *Epikerfragment bei Seneca?* *Tranq.* 4. 5 *stat tamen et clamore iuuat*. Miscellen: W. Heraeus, *Congustus*. Traces of this adj. e.g. in the poem of the Anthology 'De balneis cuiusdam pauperibus.' M. Pokrowskij, *Spätlateinisches*. Notes on the *Thesaurus Glossarum*

*Emendatarum.*

*Conque = quando*

Honorius 1st (6)

Lindsay's *Synta*

ab. VIII, 1hm

F. Buecheler.

#### Nmemosy

S. A. Naber

and minor, Ion

rat. aud. 38 8:

(contd. from vol

it introduces in

exiles, who co

keeping of defi

office became a

*De Euripideae*

of the new ve

cap. ex. inim.

*coniecturae in*

Samia.

36. 4. 19

P. H. Da

of Bks. 1-6: c

II 135 (*impu*

665 (*solem rad*

*fros*) and con

IV 75, 410, V

'Hlaov so that

C. Brakman,

pro Sulla, pro

*Notulae ad alt*

on Epitrepont

*mae. VI et V*

Aristoph.) diffi

have not yet

J. J. H., *Ad*

S. A. Naber,

37. 1. 1

S. A. Naber

(p. 515 E to e

*Quaestiones G*

*Plutarchus*. I

8 iv ois, τὸ νικ

*Comici fragm*

vol. 36). No

ἰστολαμβάνω

vol. 36). 7.

(cp. 7. 481,

*Emendatarum.* C. Weyman, *Eualere*. Occurs in Vincentius of Lerinum. Idem, *Cumque = quandocumque*. In conn. with Hor. O. 1. 32, quotes an inscription of Pope Honorius 1st (625-638) where *cumque uelit = quandocumque uolet*. *Literatur*, 1907-1908: Lindsay's *Syntax of Plautus*, Peterson's *Verrinae*, Gercke's *Senecae naturalium quaest.* lib. VIII, Ihm's *Suetoni opera Vol. I* and other books are noticed. *Nekrolog*: F. Buecheler. *Mitteilung der Redaktion*. This is the last number of the *Archiv*.

### Mnemosyne. 36. 3. 1908.

S. A. Naber, *Platonica* (contd.). Euthydemus, Protag., Gorg., Meno, Hipp. maior and minor, Ion, Menexenus, Clitophon, Republic. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. De rect. rat. aud. 38 B: read *προμηχανόμενος* for *προμνόμενος*. I. M. J. Valetton, *Quaestt. Graecae* (contd. from vol. 16). The Lygdamis inscription of Halicarnassus. Nature of the changes it introduces in the matter of property-disputes: it is evidently directed against the exiles, who could not return within the year and a half mentioned therein. The keeping of definite records must have become a duty of the mnemonics as soon as their office became an annual one. Restoration etc. of part of the inscription. K. Kuiper, *De Euripideae fabulae Pirithoi fragmento nuper reperto*. Shews the Euripidean character of the new verses given in *Rhein. Mus.* 63, p. 145. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. De cap. ex. inim. util. 92 B. Read *περιστέλλων* for *περιέπων*. H. van Herwerden, *Novae coniecturae in fragm. Menandreae reperta a Lefeburio*. Epitrepontes, Perikeiromene, Samia.

### 36. 4. 1908.

P. H. Damsté, *Adn. ad. Statii Thebaidem*. Emendations and defence of the text of Bks. 1-6: e.g. defence of I 87 (*modo digna ueni*), 517 (*ostro tenuis auroque sonantis*), II 135 (*impulerat*), 721 (*deuertis*), III 379 (*auditusque iterum*), IV 109 (*aegrescunt*), 665 (*solem radiis ignescere ferri*), V 30 (*artis toris*), 574 (*peregit*), 692 (*alis*), VI 25 (*labori feras*) and conjectures on II 71 (note on Statius' love for *totus*), III 217, 234, 314, IV 75, 410, VI 53, 79-83, 544. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In Quom. adol. 19 F omit 'Ἥλιον so that *μηνέειν* means 'significare'; in De lib. educ. 10 F read *θείων* for *θεών*. C. Brakman, *Ad schol. Bobiensia*. Conjectures (affecting mainly notes on Verrines, pro Sulla, pro Sest., pro Flacc., pro Mil., pro Planc., pro Arch.). H. van Herwerden, *Notulae ad alteram Loeuwenii ed. fragmentorum Menandrorum recens detectorum*. Mainly on Epitrepontes and Perikeiromene. K. Kuiper, *De vocab. τρόπος ut atque usu per saec. VI et V*. The older usage (Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles). The later (Herod—Aristoph.) differs mainly in its tendency to make the word equivalent to *ἦθος*, but they have not yet got as far as the *ἐκάστω τὸν τρόπον συνήρμοσαν φροῦρμαρχον* of Menander. J. J. H., *Ad Plutarchum*. In Praec. reip. ger. 820 A read *τίμημα* for *τιμὴν ἅμα*. S. A. Naber, *Platonica* (from part 3). Emendations of Rep. III-VI.

### 37. 1. 1909.

S. A. Naber, *Platonica* (continued from vol. 36). Emendations, etc., on Republic (p. 515 E to end), Timaeus, Critias, Minos, Laws, *Epistulae*, Scholia. J. M. J. Valetton, *Quaestiones Graecae*. III De Inscr. Lygdamensi (continued from vol. 36). J. J. H., *Plutarchus*. In de lib. educ. p. 10 A put a long stop after *καλόν*, and then read *ἴσθι* ὅτι οὐδὲ τὸ νικᾶν βλαβερὸν καὶ ὡς ἀληθὺς νίκη Κωμεία. J. van Leeuwen, *Ad Aristophanis Comici fragmenta nuper reperta*. C. Brakman, *Ad Apulei Apologiam* (continued from vol. 36). Notes and emendations. J. J. H., *Plutarchus*. In de lib. educ. 8 A eject *πολαμπάνω* and read *τοῖν* for *δυνον*. P. H. Damsté, *Adn. ad Statii Thebaidem* (from vol. 36). 7. 1 atque ita, 98 lugenti 'quod praeda sibi eripiat', 134 pectore right (cp. 7. 481, 9. 89, 151, 12. 606), 308 calentem, 338 incidere right (cp. 11. 255,

*Ach.* 2. 136), 634 *scit fessa manus* (cp. 7. 792), 798 *alius* right (cp. 804 sqq. *mors alia*). 8. 147-8: *reliqui* (taking *rector* as vocative), 154 *more* right. 9. 183 *nunc iam*, 218 *cu fulmine*, 419 *unaque genus*, 625 *natum*, 747 *efflat faucibus*, 865 *telis dextramque*. 10. 26 *rapti* (for *nigri*), 295 *animas*, 441 *interea uti*, 743 *agit furias*, 916 *aut iterum*. 11. 242 sqq. The first six lines alone belong to the *nuntius*, 529 *rumpunt*. 12. 5 *raris* = 'left empty,' 430 *renuere*, 547 *semina* right (cp. *Ach.* 2. 89, *Theb.* 4. 212, etc.). J. J. H., *Plutarchus*. In *Præc. reip. ger.* 803 c insert *σκόπτειν* after *κατάρχοντα*, 816 a delete *καὶ* before *ἀρχοντα* or read for it *τῶν*, 824 c delete *εὐχόμενος*. H. v. H., *Tentantur duo loci ex A. Klottii dissertatione* 'Zwei neue Blätter des *Perikeiromene*.' J. van Leeuwen, *Ad Menandrum*. Notes on *Her.* 45, *Disc.* 168, 192, 455, 451, 494, *Circum.* 75, 186, *Sam.* 18, 102, 232. Traces iambs in Plutarch's *σύγκρισις* of Aristophanes and Menander and believes he had before him a metrical composition. v. L., *Ad Aristoph. Vesp.* 1179. Photius s.v. *ἀνθρωπικὸς μῦθος* to be emended: *ἀνθρ. μῦθος*] *ὁ περὶ ἀνθρωπικῶν πραγμάτων ἔχων τὴν ὑπόθεσιν*. *Ἀριστοφάνης* *Σφηξίν.* *ἀνθρωπίζεταί*] *Ἀριστοφάνης*. *Ἀμφικαρπία*.

### Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie. 1908.

- 4 Sept. E. Drerup, [*Ἡρώδου*] *περὶ πολιτείας* (G. J. Schneider), favourable. J. May, *Rhythmische Analyse der Rede Ciceros pro S. Roscio Amerino* (W. Kroll). Volkman, *Die Harmonie der Sphären in Ciceros Traum des Scipio* (M. Manitius). 'A sound investigation.' G. Pierleoni, *L'allitterazione nell' astronomicon di Manilio* (H. Kleingünther), favourable. *Poematis latini rell. ex vol. Herculanensi evulgatas denuo rec.* I. Ferrara (M. Manitius). 'May almost be regarded as definitive.' A. Engeli, *Die Oratio variata bei Pausanias* (A. Thumb), favourable. W. Kunzmann, *Quaestiones de Pseudo-Luciani libelli qui est de Longaevis fontibus atque auctoritate* (P. Schulze). 'Shows diligence but does not further the investigation.' A. Merlin, *Rapport sur les inscriptions latines de la Tunisie* (M. J.). *Ausonia*, Rivista della società italiana di archeologia I. Jahrgang (J. Ziehen).
- 11 Sept. D. Baud-Bovy et Fr. Boissonnas, *En Grèce par monts et par vaux*. Avec des notices archéologiques par G. Nicole et une préface par Th. Homolle (A. Trendelenburg), very favourable. W. Brachmann, *Die Gebärde bei Homer* (Chr. Harder). 'Answers a real need.' Sophocles, *The Trachiniae*, abridged from Jebb's larger edition by G. A. Davies (H. Steinberg), favourable. G. Modugno, *Il concetto della vita nella filosofia greca* (J. Ziehen), favourable on the whole. Manilius, *Astronomica*, herausg. von Th. Breiter. II. *Kommentar* (M. Manitius). 'Fills a great gap.'
- 18 Sept. G. Nicole, *Meidias et le style fleuri dans la céramique attique* (A. Trendelenburg), favourable. R. Thiele, *Im jonischen Kleinasien* (G. Lang), favourable. O. Fritsch, *Delos*, and O. Fritsch, *Delphi* (G. Lang). 'Interesting to advanced schoolboys.' Cicero, *Brutus*, erkl. von O. Jahn. 5. Aufl. von W. Kroll (H. Steinberg). *Horatius*, herausg. von O. Keller und J. Häussner. 3. Aufl. (H. Belling), favourable.
- 25 Sept. E. Wittich, *Homer in seinen Bildern und Vergleichen* (H. Draheim), favourable. N. Pavlatos, *Ἡ παρὰ τοῦ Ὀδυσσεύς* (P. Goessler), unfavourable. Th. Wagner, *Symbolarum ad comicorum Graecorum historiam criticam capita quattuor* (Fr. Spiro), very favourable. E. Breccia, *Il diritto dinastico nelle monarchie dei successori d' Alessandro Magno* (Fr. Cauer). 'A careful and thorough investigation.' M. Niedermann und E. Hermann, *Historische Lautlehre der Lateinischen* (Bartholomae). 'To be recommended to all concerned with Latin grammar.'
- 2 Oct. J. Partsch, *Das Alter der Inselnatur von Leukas* (P. Goessler), favourable. M. V. Williams, *Six essays on the Platonic theory of Knowledge* (G. Lehnert). 'A welcome introduction to the problems of Plato.' L. Venturini, *Tarquinius il Superbo* (Fr. Cauer). 'Arbitrary and subjective, and so not convincing.'
- 9 Oct. J. Vürtheim, *De Aiace origine, cultu, patria; accedunt commentationes tres de*

*Amazonibus, d. Parthenione* (F. opera, rec. T. edition of the favourable. R. tion.' A. v. P. favourable. Z. Koenen). 16 Oct. Hennings), fav. Schiche. 2 A. gemalde von reality.' 23 Oct. *Anthropologie the classical G. II. (Th. Star A. Hartmann, 30 Oct. Die Kausalsä thanks.' N. thoroughness Glotta. Zeits und Fr. Sku American Sch Egbert, A. W. W. Beck (M. Wartenberg), 6 Nov. the assistance *Materialien z L. Mitteis, A und Lehre vo Apologie des I 13 Nov. 7. Aufl. (Fr. Demosthenis M. Barone, S Fr. Reich, favourable. Grundbegriffe 20 Nov. (O. Kern). (O. Kern). Syntax des Gedichte, erk von P. Deuti able. *Persi 27 Nov. Arndt, Das Philosophie ( topicorum til***

*Amazonibus, de Carneis, de Telegonia* (H. Steuding), favourable. C. Kukula, *Alkman's Partheneion* (H. St.). H. Wolf, *Die Religion der alten Römer* (H. St.), favourable. *Homeric opera*, rec. T. W. Allen. Tom. III, IV (P. Cauer). 'Has not made a step beyond his edition of the Iliad.' G. Rudberg, *Textstudien zur Tiergeschichte des Aristoteles* (M. Manitius), favourable. R. Bloch, *De Pseudo-Luciani amoribus* (A. Bonhöffer). 'A sound contribution.' A. v. Premenstein, *Das Attentat der Konsulare auf Hadrian im Jahre 118* (Köhler), favourable. *The Loeb Collection of Arretine Pottery*, catalogued by G. H. Chase (C. Koenen).

16 Oct. H. Schiller, *Beiträge zur Wiederherstellung der Odyssee*. II. (P. D. Ch. Hennings), favourable. *Ciceronis Tusculanarum disputationum libri V*, herausg. von Th. Schiche. 2 Aufl. (H. Steinberg). M. Siebourg, *Akropolis und Forum Romanum*. Wandgemälde von M. Roeder (Köhler). 'Do not fulfil their principal object—to represent reality.'

23 Oct. E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*. 2. Aufl. I. 1. *Einleitung, Elemente der Anthropologie* (Fr. Cauer), favourable. K. Rees, *The [so-called] rule of three actors in the classical Greek drama* (F. Adami), very favourable. J. Vahlen, *Opuscula academica*. II. (Th. Stangl). E. Stroebel, *Tulliana. On the de Inventione*. 'Very useful work.' A. Hartmann, *De inventione juvenalis capita tria* (H. Blümner), favourable.

30 Oct. A. Fairbanks, *Athenian Lekythoi* (H. L. Ulrichs), favourable. M. Nilsson, *Die Kausalsätze im Griechischen bis Aristoteles* (Helbing). 'Learned and deserving of thanks.' N. Terzaghi, *Appunti sui paragoni nei tragici Greci* (Helbing). 'Shows thoroughness and diligence.' E. Krause, *Diogenes von Apollonia* (G. Lehnert), favourable. *Glotta. Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache*, herausg. von P. Kretschmer und Fr. Skutsch. I, 2/3 (R. Meister), very favourable. *Supplementary Papers of the American School of classical studies in Rome*. II. By G. H. Allen, Ch. D. Curtis, J. C. Egbert, A. W. van Buren (Th. Stang). Ekkehard's *Waltharius*. Ein Kommentar von W. Beck (M. Manitius), favourable. D. Aiginetes, *Τὸ κλίμα τῆς Ἀττικῆς*. I. II. (G. Wartenberg), favourable.

6 Nov. *The Tebtunis papyri*. Part II. ed. by B. S. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt, with the assistance of E. J. Goodspeed (A. Stein). 'A new and priceless gift.' Fr. Helm, *Materialien zur Herodotolektüre* (W. Gemoll). 'To be recommended to all students.' L. Mitteis, *Römisches Privatrecht bis auf die Zeit Diokletians*. Band I. *Grundbegriffe und Lehre von den juristischen Personen* (E. Grupe) I. A. Müller, *Zur Überlieferung der Apologie des Firmicus Maternus* (J. Dräseke), favourable.

13 Nov. W. Luckenbach, *Kunst und Geschichte*. I. *Abbildungen zur alten Geschichte*. 7. Aufl. (Fr. Harder), favourable. K. Witte, *Quaestiones tragicæ* (F. Adami), favourable. *Demosthenis orationes*, rec. S. H. Butcher. I. II. (May). 'Does not show much progress.' M. Barone, *Sull' uso dell' Aoristo nel περὶ τῆς ἀντιδόσεως di Isocrate* (Helbing), favourable. Fr. Reisch, *De adiectivis Graecis in us motionis Graecae linguae specimen* (Helbing) favourable. L. Mitteis, *Römisches Privatrecht bis auf die Zeit Diokletians*. Band I. *Grundbegriffe und Lehre von den juristischen Personen* (E. Grupe), II, very favourable.

20 Nov. *Briefwechsel zwischen A. Böckh und L. Dissen*, herausg. von M. Hoffmann (O. Kern). *Imagines inscriptionum graecarum antiquissimarum*, tert. ed. H. Roehl (O. Kern). 'The third edition shows a great advance.' J. M. Stahl, *Kritisch-historische Syntax des griechischen Verbums der klassischen Zeit* (Helbing), very favourable. *Vergils Gedichte*, erkl. von Th. Ludwig und C. Schaper. I. *Bukolika und Georgika*. 8. Aufl. von P. Deuticke (F. Skutsch), favourable. F. Keppeler *Über Copa* (F. Skutsch), unfavourable. *Persi et juvenalis satirae*, rec. S. G. Owen. Ed. alt. (J. Ziehen), favourable.

27 Nov. *Euripide, les Bacchantes*, par G. Dalmeyda (K. Busche), favourable. E. Arndt, *Das Verhältnis der Verstandeserkenntnis zur sinnlichen in der vorsokratischen Philosophie* (A. Döring). 'A serious and careful piece of work.' J. Pflug, *De Aristotelis topicorum libro V*. (G. Lehnert), favourable. G. Gundel, *De stellarum appellatione et*

*religione Romana* (J. Moeller). 'Deserves approval.' A. Welzel, *De Claudiani et Corippi sermone epico* (M. Manitius), favourable. *Pseudo-Augustini Quaestiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti*, rec. A. Souter (C. Weyman), favourable. *Augustini scripta contra Donatistas*. Pars I. rec. M. Petschenig (C. Weyman), favourable.

4 Dec. F. Emlein, *De locis quos ex Ciceronis orationibus in Institutionis oratoriae XII. libris laudavit Quintilianus* (May), favourable. J. Cornu, *Beiträge zur lateinischen Metrik* (H. Draheim), unfavourable on the whole. Guil. Noetzel, *De archaismis qui apud veteres Romanorum poetas scaenicos inveniuntur in finibus aut versuum aut colorum in iambum exeuntium* (H. Draheim), favourable. P. J. M. Plattisch, *Die Rede Konstantius d. Gr. an die Versammlung der Heiligen*, auf ihre Echtheit untersucht (J. Dräseke), favourable. N. E. Griffin, *Dares und Dictys* (J. Dräseke), unfavourable.

11 Dec. P. Friedländer, *Herakles* (H. Steuding). 'Stimulating but not reliable.' Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*. The choral odes and lyric scenes set to music by J. E. Lodge (A. Thierfelder), unfavourable. E. Graf, *Der Kampf um die Musik im griechischen Altertum* (A. Thierfelder), favourable. Plato, *Apology*, ed. by H. Williamson (D.), favourable. Virgil's *Aeneid*, Books I.-VI. by R. Fairclough and L. Brown (D.), favourable. F. O. Norton, *A lexicographical and historical study of Διαθήκη* (J. Dräseke), favourable.

18 Dec. B. Knös, *Codex Graecus XV. Upsaliensis* (K. Busche). 'A valuable contribution.' J. Burnet, *Early Greek philosophy*. 2. ed. (W. Nestle), very favourable. E. Galli, *Per la Sibaritide* (H. Nissen), unfavourable. G. Napoletani, *Fermo nel Pieno* (H. Nissen), favourable. C. Dubois, *Pouzzoles antique* (H. Nissen), very favourable. A. Elter, *Itinerarstudien*. I. II. (Köhler), favourable. A. Naegle, *Chrysostomos und Libanios* (J. Dräseke), very favourable.

25 Dec. Th. Sinko, *Adnotationes ad Euripidis Bachas* (K. Busche), unfavourable. Fr. Isler, *Quaestiones metricae* (D.). On the paragogic nu in Homer and other poets. P. Barth, *Die Stoa*. 2. Aufl. (A. Bonhöffer), very favourable. R. Faust, *De Lucani orationibus*. I (R. Helm), favourable. L. Weigl, *Johannes Kamateros Εισαγωγή ἀρτοποποιίας* (J. Dräseke), favourable.

1909.

4 Jan. H. F. Hitzig, *Allgriechische Staatsverträge über Rechtshilfe* (Fr. Cauer), favourable. W. Nestle, *Herodots Verhältnis zur Philosophie und Sophistik* (W. Gemoll). 'Shows learning and judgment.' J. N. Svoronos, *Τὰ νομίσματα τοῦ κράτους τῶν Πτολεμαίων*. IV (H. v. Fritze), favourable. J. Sundwall, *Untersuchungen über die attischen Münzen des neueren Stiles* (K. Regling), favourable. K. Schneider, *Die griechischen Gymnasien und Palästre* (J. Ziehen). 'Shows great diligence and generally sound judgment.' A. Struck, *Makedonische Fahrten*. II. (G. Wartenberg), favourable. Terence, *The comedies*, by S. G. Ashmore (P. Wessner), unfavourable. P. Mihaileanu, *De comprehensionibus relativis opud Ciceronem* (E. A. Gutjahr-Probst), favourable. A. Loercher, *De compositione et fonte libri Ciceronis qui est de fato* (A. Bonhöffer). 'A valuable contribution to the problem.' G. Zottoli, *Lusus Pompeianus* (H. D.). On an inscr. of Pompeii. H. Zwicker, *Wie studiert man klassische Philologie?* (J. Ziehen), favourable.

11 Jan. F. Schulte, *Archytas qui ferebantur de notionibus universalibus et de oppositis libellorum reliquiae* (A. Bonhöffer). 'A sound piece of work.' H. Schmidt, *De Hermino Peripatetico* (A. Bonhöffer), unfavourable. O. Kolffhaus, *Plutarchi de communibus notitiis librum genuinum esse demonstratur* (A. Bonhöffer), very favourable. W. Tschajkanovitsch, *Quaestionum paroemiographicarum capita selecta* (W. Gemoll), favourable. F. Jobst, *Über das Verhältnis von Lucretius und Empedokles* (W. Nestle). 'A useful contribution.' T. Fitzhugh, *Prolegomena to the history of Italo-Romanic rhythm* (H. G.), favourable. T. Steinwender, *Ursprung und Entwicklung des Manipularsystems* (R. Oehler), very favourable. T. A. Abele, *Der Senat unter Augustus* (W. Soltau). 'A useful collection of material.' H. Zierner, *Aus dem Reiche der Psychologie* (O. Weise), favourable.

18 Jan. whole. M. C. die 21. Rede d. 25 Jan.

III. Greek an University A inscriptions. Part I. by W. pertinentium o direction de P von U. Thiem und Algebra (et Latini phot

## America

1. W. B. Dir True kno Fergusson, and elemen A useful bit 2. J. B. Cart Topograp Servian City and by the there is no 3. L. D. Cas Discusses a projecting 4. O. M. Wa Supports p. 151), criti 5. Archaeolo 6. Bibliograp

## Part 3.

1. G. H. Cha seven cuts.) Three tri mythologica are Ionic C Etruscan im 2. Esther B. The major Vestal statue 3. B. W. Rob One is of places and o 4. Archaeolog



18 Jan. F. Bechtel, *Die Vokalcontraction bei Homer* (P. Cauer), favourable on the whole. M. Carroll, *The Attica of Pausanias* (A. Trendelenburg), favourable. Knappe, *Ist die 21. Rede des Gaudentius echt?* (J. Dräseke). 'A worthy contribution.'

25 Jan. *Publications of an American Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1899-1900*. III. *Greek and Latin inscriptions* by W. K. Prentice, and *Publications of the Princeton University Archaeological Expedition to Syria in 1904-1906*. III. *Greek and Latin inscriptions*. Sec. A: *Southern Syria*, by E. Littmann. Part I. Sec. B: *Northern Syria*. Part I. by W. K. Prentice (W. Larfeld). G. Thieme, *Quaestionum comicarum ad Periclem pertinentium capita III* (Schneider), rather unfavourable. *Papyrus Grecs*, publiés sous la direction de P. Jonguet (C. Wessely). *Allgemeines Lexikon der bildenden Künstler*, herausg. von U. Thieme und F. Becker. II. (A. Brückner), favourable. A. v. Velics, *Onomatopöie und Algebra* (O. Weise), very unfavourable. A. W. Sijthoffs, *Unternehmen der Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti* (G. Andresen), very favourable.

## ARCHAEOLOGICAL.

### American Journal of Archaeology. 1908. Part 2.

1. W. B. Dinsmore: The Mausoleum at Halicarnassos. II. (Three plates, four cuts.) True knowledge of the design to be attained by following R. M. Smith, Pullan, Fergusson, and Adler; in addition, the knowledge of the exact dimensions of members and elements of design, shews how Pythios followed certain principles of proportion. A useful bibliography of ancient and modern descriptions is appended.
2. J. B. Carter: Roma Quadrata and the Septimontium. Topographical methods of study of Rome must be corrected by historical. That the Servian City was preceded by a City of Four Regions is shewn by the Calendar of Numa and by the Pomoerium within the Servian wall. Apart from and earlier than this, there is no evidence of Roma Quadrata or the Septimontium.
3. L. D. Caskey and B. H. Hill: The 'Metopon' in the Erechtheum. (Eight cuts.) Discusses an inscription in Brit. Mus. (*J.G.* i. 322). The μέτρον (col. 1, line 30) was a projecting interior partition at the S.W. corner.
4. O. M. Washburn: The Charioteer of Amphion at Delphi. (Cut.) Supports the Cyrenaic origin of the monument against the Syracusan (cf. *A.J.A.* 1906, p. 151), criticising chiefly the views of Pomtow.
5. Archaeological Discussions, ed. J. M. Paton.
6. Bibliography, 1907.

### Part 3.

1. G. H. Chase: Three bronze Tripods belonging to James Loeb, Esq. (Eleven plates, seven cuts.) Three tripods from Perugia, reconstructed by Hoffmann of Boston, all with various mythological subjects (Bellerophon, Perseus, etc.). They date from about 550 B.C., and are Ionic Greek work, whereas the similar bronze and silver reliefs from Perugia are Etruscan imitations.
2. Esther B. van Deman: The value of the Vestal Statues as originals. (Seventeen cuts.) The majority not portraits but 'shop-copies' of well-known types; not important as Vestal statues, except where portrait heads have been attached.
3. B. W. Robinson: Two new inscriptions from Beersheba. (Two cuts.) One is of the fourth century; the other, an imperial edict regulating the yearly tax of places and officials in South Palestine.
4. Archaeological News, Jan.-June 1908, ed. W. N. Bates.



**Jahrbuch des deutschen arch. Instituts.** xxiii. 1908. Heft 1.

1. T. Wiegand: The Hippodrome of Constantinople in the time of Suleiman the Great. (Plate, two cuts.)

Discusses latest evidence for its appearance before 1516, as given by an artist and an architect; the former incorrect in some points; attempts a reconstruction of the colonnade on these lines.

2. E. Petersen: Gleanings in Athens. (Three cuts.)

(1) The Pyrgos and Nike-temple contemporary with the Propylaea. (2) Exact position of Artemis-Hekate, Hermes, Charites, and Chalkotheke on Acropolis discussed. (3) Criticism of Dörpfeld's views on Hellenistic *skene* of theatre.

3. R. Zahn: Hellenistic relief-vases from South Russia. (Forty-nine cuts.)

Describes thirty-seven examples from Vogel collection, mostly of the 'Megarian' bowl type.

*Anzeiger.* (1) Notice of A. Kirchhoff's death.

(2) Excavations at Lachish (H. Thiersch; nineteen cuts).

(3) Miscellanea (Petersen).

(4) Meeting of Berlin Arch. Gesellschaft, Nov. 1907.

(5) Bibliography.

## Heft 2.

1. G. Kropatschek: Pestles and *Pila muralia*. (Plate; fourteen cuts.)

Discusses wooden implements, obviously weapons, found in camp at Oberaden, Lippe; similar to pestles used as weapons in Greek vase-scenes (e.g. Brygos' *Iliupersis*). Since *pilum*=Gk. *ὑπερον*, these are probably *pila muralia*, used in emergencies as weapons of defence.

2. E. Pernice: Diskos-throwing. (Three cuts.)

Deals with Gardiner's paper in *J.H.S.* xxvii., and discusses movement of legs in throwing.

3. B. Sauer: Nike in the Parthenon Pediments. (Cut.)

Criticises C. Smith's theory (*J.H.S.* xxvii.); Nike impossible in West Pediment, improbable in East.

4. E. Pernice: The Tripod from the Isis-temple at Pompeii. (Four cuts.)

Bronze tripod in Naples Museum, probably from Herculaneum, has been botched up in ancient times.

5. T. Birt: Addenda to *Buchrolle in der Kunst*.

Disputes Pfuhl's corrections and additions in *Jahrb.* xxii., p. 113.

*Anzeiger.* (1) Annual report of Arch. Inst.

(2) Finds in 1907 (Europe, *except Britain*; Asia; Africa).

(3) Bibliography.

**Athenische Mittheilungen.** Vol. XXIII. Heft 1-2. 1908.

1. A. Prandtl: Fragments of the Parthenon Pediments. (Four plates; four cuts.)

Identifies seven fragments in Acropolis Museum with pediment-figures: foot of 'Prometheus'; drapery and left hand of Zeus; torso of Erysichthon and head of Athena (W.); fragments of wings from both.

2. A. Frickenhaus: Statue of Athena in the Old Temple at Athens. (Four cuts.)

Not a 'Palladion' type, which was introduced by Peisistratos, but an older seated type with libation-bowl, for which there is evidence in vases, terra-cottas, and inscriptions.

3. F. Noe: Walls s
4. C. Fred: Notes o
5. E. Nach: Two in
6. G. Karo: a stele no
7. H. Lattu: Dates t
8. C. Fred: but with a
9. R. Page: Addition
10. P. Groe: Descript
11. U. von: Publish
12. T. Wieg: next to th
13. F. Hiller: 250 B.C.
14. Id.: Amp
15. K. Kurur: Publish
16. A. Frick: from Perg
17. K. Rhom: Criticises
18. W. Dörpf: Archidamia
19. A. Bruck: its success
20. A. Bruck: Thirt
21. A. Bruck: Establish
22. A. Bruck: Deals wi
23. A. Bruck: A head
24. A. Bruck: characterist
25. A. Bruck: Erechthe
26. A. Bruck: the Brygos
27. A. Bruck: child is a l
28. A. Bruck: The first
29. A. Bruck: form not li
30. A. Bruck: are certainl
31. A. Bruck: The new
32. A. Bruck: pre-historic
33. A. Bruck: metal objec
34. A. Bruck: A final e
35. A. Bruck: burials in t

3. F. Noack: Remarks on the Walls of Peiraeus.  
Walls shown to belong to fourth century.
4. C. Fredrich: From Philippi and Neighbourhood. (Two cuts.)  
Notes on inscriptions.
5. E. Nachmanson: Pre-Greek Inscriptions from Lemnos. (Plate and cut.)  
Two inscriptions in alphabet resembling old Phrygian, but non-Greek language, on a stele now at Athens; reading discussed.
6. G. Karo: The Tyrsenian Stele from Lemnos. (Seven cuts.)  
Dates the above, by means of relief on stele, as sixth century; style un-Greek, but with affinities to early Etruscan; assigned to Tyrsenians.
7. H. Lattermann: The Architectural Inscription from Athens. (Cut.)  
Additional comments and suggestions on that published in *Ath. Mitth.* xxxi, p. 135.
8. C. Fredrich: Imbros. (32 cuts.)  
Description of ancient sites, inscriptions, and antiquities (terra-cottas, pottery, coins).
9. R. Pagenstecher: The Athena Parthenos of Pheidias. (Four cuts.)  
Publishes clay medallion from Athens, with head of this type; the earliest copy next to the Crimea gold relief; from the top of a Campanian *guttus* of about 300-250 B.C.
10. P. Groebe: Roman Honorary Inscriptions. (Cut.)  
Publishes an Athenian inscription to Cn. Pompeius Strabo (89 B.C.), and three from Pergamon.
11. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf: Eleutherae.  
Criticises *Ath. Mitth.* xxxii, p. 561 ff.; Eleutherae not made subject to Athens in Archidamian War; the Oinoe of Thucydides and Herodotus is really this place, or its successor Melainae.
12. T. Wiegand: Inscriptions from the Levant. (Three cuts.)  
Thirty-one inscriptions from Constantinople and Asia Minor, mostly Greek.
13. F. Hiller von Gaertringen: Inscriptions of uncertain origin.  
Establishes the origin of some previously published as from unknown sources.
14. *Id.*: Amphorae from Paphos.  
Deals with six found in 1903, with names of eponymous priest, maker, and month.
15. K. Kuruniotis: Marble Head from Arcadia. (Plate, two cuts.)  
A head found near Phigaleia, the only example of marble sculpture from Arcadia; characteristic treatment of hair; Egyptian influence visible.
16. A. Frickenhaus: Erechtheus.  
Erechtheus was conceived as inhabiting the cista on the Acropolis in serpent-form (cf. the Brygos vase), and thus became the protecting serpent of Athena; the Erichthonios child is a later invention of the fifth century.
17. K. Rhomaïos: Potters' Kilns in Kynuria. (Cut.)  
The first discovery of a potter's kiln in Greece, belonging to the third century B.C.; form not like Roman, but as depicted on vases; hence those on the Corinthian pinakes are certainly potters' kilns.
18. W. Dörpfeld: Olympia in pre-historic times. (Four cuts.)  
The new excavations support the writer's view of the early origin of Olympia; a pre-historic settlement found with remains of dwellings and primitive pottery, but no metal objects.
19. A. Brueckner: Excavations at Agia Triada.  
A final exploration of the site, made for a plan, has thrown fresh light on its use for burials in the fifth century.

## Heft 3.

1. E. Nachmannson: Inscriptions from Athens. (Plate.)  
Publishes list of treasurers of Athena for 349-8 B.C., the first of the kind known; also a unique dedication to the goddess Horme; and two others.
2. E. D. Keramopulos: On *I.G.* vii. 2463 and 553.
3. C. Friedrich: Thasos. (Three plates, seven cuts.)  
Topography and remains of the city of Thasos and other sites.
4. F. Versace: The Temple and Stoa in the Amphiaraeum at Oropus. (Four plates, seven cuts.)  
A full description of buildings hitherto scantily published; the temple Doric prostyle, the stoa also Doric, with a chamber at each end for male and female devotees respectively to sleep in; both date about 390 B.C.
5. G. Kawerau: Tripod-stands from the Acropolis, Athens. (Three cuts.)  
Some poros blocks found in 1885-90 not hitherto explained, shewn to be bases for tripods.
6. M. P. Nilsson: Serpent-stele of Zeus Ktesios. (Cut.)  
Found at Thespieae; dedicatory inscription of third century; Zeus Ktesios a domestic god, *sc.* of the store-room, probably the same as Philios and Melichios; originally conceived as a serpent; may be compared with Pompeian domestic shrines.
7. A. J. B. Wace and N. I. Giannopulos: Communications from Thessaly.  
Wace describes pre-historic settlements at Zerelia; Giannopulos gives some additions to Thessaly volume of *Corpus* (*I.G.* ix. pt. 2).
8. W. Dörpfeld: Old Pylos. (Three plates, five cuts.)  
Describes three beehive tombs discovered on the site of the Homeric Pylos, dating about 1500 B.C.
9. *Id.*: Pisa near Olympia.  
Deals with discovery of pre-historic walls and tombs of the same period as those at Olympia (*v. supra*), confirming the traditional site of Pisa.
10. *Id.*: The Homeric town of Arene.  
On the site of the later Samikon are remains of a pre-historic town (late Minoan II. period); this must be the Arene of *Il.* xi. 723.
11. K. Müller: Temple of Artemis at Kombotekra.  
Poros building of fifth century recently discovered near Pylos; shewn by dedicatory finds to have been a shrine of Artemis; these include primitive bronzes and terra-cottas, and late Greek vases.

**Journal of Hellenic Studies.** xxviii. 1908. Part 2.

1. J. P. Droop: Two Cyrenaic Kylikes. (Four cuts.)
2. A. W. Van Buren: Inscriptions from Asia Minor, Cyprus, and the Cyrenaica. (Two cuts.)
3. W. W. Tarn: The Fleet of Xerxes. (Map.)
4. W. Miller: The Marquisate of Boudonitza. (Four cuts.)
5. L. Dyer: The Olympian Theatron and the Battle of Olympia.
6. F. H. Marshall: A Graeco-Roman Bronze Lamp. (Plate.)
7. W. M. Flinders Petrie: The Structure of Herodotus, Book II.
8. G. E. Underhill: Theopompus (or Cratippus), Hellenica.
9. A. M. Woodward: Some Unpublished Attic Inscriptions.
10. J. D. Beazley: Three New Vases in the Ashmolean Museum. (Three plates.)
11. R. M. Dawkins: Archaeology in Greece, 1907-08.
12. A. J. B. Wace: Topography of Pelion and Magnesia (Addenda).
13. D. G. Hogarth: The Archaic Artemisia.  
Notices of Books, Rules, Proceedings, etc.

H. B. W.

known; also a

(Four plates,  
Doric prostyle,  
es respectively

to be bases for

ios a domestic  
os; originally  
nes.

y.  
he additions to

Pylos, dating

od as those at

ate Minoan II.

by dedicatory  
nd terra-cottas,

he Cyrenaica.

e plates.)

H. B. W.